The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THIS issue is largely devoted to the proceedings of the International Congregational Council which met at Wellesley College, Massachusetts, in June. The first important fact about this Conference, as about any other, is that it was held, that representative Congregationalists from five continents and nineteen national Unions came together at this time to make ourselves known to one another, to support one another in the conviction and faith which we all share, to exchange news and views, to discover whether our distinctive witness is still needed and, if so, how it can best be expressed, to find out whether and how far the different religious and social climates of the world are modifying what each of us regards as essential Congregationalism.

* * *

BUT let us first acknowledge the abounding hospitality of our American hosts, both official and personal. In spite of the preoccupation of important developments in American Congregationalism, whose suggested merger with the Evangelical and Reformed Church enabled Professor Reinhold Niebuhr to describe himself as 'an adopted stepson of Congregationalism', an immense energy and generosity made this conference possible. None of us could take much money and some could take none. Invited Unions that could not afford to send delegates were not allowed to stay away. In spite of difficulties, of which we visitors heard nothing, it was made possible for us to gather from Australia, South Africa and Canada, China, Japan, the Philippine Islands and Honolulu, North and South India, British Guiana, the West Indies, Puerto Rico, Brazil and Mexico, Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands and Finland as well as England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland with our hosts, to hear the wonderful works of God, to worship together and think together, examining our churches against the needs, dangers and opportunities of our various situations and seeking the leading of the Holy Spirit in interpreting God's revelation of Himself in our present grievous necessities.

* * *

OUR hosts themselves had come from far and wide. Whatever the geography books say, the United States is itself a continent which,

by one of the continuing miracles of history, is also a country. An old student of United College, Bradford, had come from Oregon and we who thought we had come a long way found to our astonishment that he had come farther, and so had others of our hosts. There were theologians, administrators, ministers and missionaries, both men and women; there were professional men and business men, of whom, perhaps, we did not hear enough; there were those like Dr. Glen Atkins whose years of service are many and full of honour and there were young men and women buckling on their armour.

* * *

Dr. Berry and Dr. Douglas Horton guided our ways with skill and grace. Whatever uncertainties may have been in the minds of some delegates, these distinguished leaders knew what they wanted to put before us, and after scrutinizing it as closely as any church meeting, we were glad to do it. No Congregational gathering we have ever known has been willing to buy a pig in a poke. So we re-formed the International Council which first met in London in 1891 and whose necessarily sporadic history is admirably told and whose new programme is sketched out in *International Congregationalism* by Drs. Peel and Douglas Horton (Pilgrim Press). We hope this little book will be widely read, for there are still too many among us who know little of Congregationalism except that they belong to it.

* * *

After the interruptions caused by the war—the Council last met in 1930—Wellesley does begin a new chapter, and our American friends wrought a good work in encouraging the smaller Unions throughout the world to attend, in order that those who live and work in small minority communities should be enabled to realize they are members of a world-wide fellowship and take their place in its organization.

* * *

Some British delegates felt they had been inadequately briefed for the Conference. Readers of the June number of the *Quarterly* had the opportunity of seeing both the Constitution recommended for adoption by the Bournemouth Preparatory Committee and the statement on *What Congregationalism Is and What It Stands For* done by a sub-committee and sent out by the Bournemouth committee. This statement was presented at Wellesley by Dr. Peel, who with Dr. Micklem had written the draft, and adopted unanimously, though with less appreciative discussion than it deserves, for it is the best short statement of who we are and what we have to give to the world and the ecumenical Church that has been done. When leadership of this quality is offered to us, is widely

circulated, including publication in these columns on the eve of the Conference, the fault, dear Brutus, is in ourselves if, when we are asked to pronounce upon it, we are compelled to rise in our places to say we have never seen it. If an opportunity of emphasis was missed at Wellesley, perhaps because it came so early in the proceedings that we were not prepared for it, let us again commend it to the attention of those who need for themselves or their young people a short, masterly statement of the faith that has gathered us into the churches of our order, and whose usefulness is not yet exhausted. We are glad to know that it has been sent to every Union associated with the Council for whatever use they are able to make of it.

* * *

THIS statement, even more than the Constitution, defines the terms of membership of the International Council. Whoever accepts this statement is a Congregationalist, by whatever name he chooses to be known. And we would be prepared to enter into formal union, as we are already in spiritual union, with all such. There is a catholicity of spirit in Congregationalism which must not be lost and there is in it a way to ecumenicity (if one must use that deplorable word), which has begun to be perceived outside ourselves. Professor Karl Barth speaking at Amsterdam said

> "Not even the Congregationalist church order is above criticism. Its representatives have not yet been able to offer a satisfactory answer to the problem of the unity of the Church and of the churches. . . . But the principle of Congregationalism—the free congregation of the free Word of God—is sound enough. At any rate, certain elements of Congregationalism are absolutely indispensable for other proposals for church order if these are not to lead to disorder, but to create real order. From this standpoint, too, the ecumenical unity of the Church can be seen more freely than anywhere else. It is obvious that the last remnants of sovereign authority in the idea of *corpus christianum* are disappearing; this suggests that we should now look in this other (Congregationalist) direction. Indirectly, this argument receives further confirmation in the reflection that a Church formed on the basis of these principles would be an event of exemplary importance in the political world of the present day."[1]

* * *

THE range of the thought of the Conference may in part be judged from the selection of papers we print. A full Report with all the addresses is shortly to be published. We hope it will be read not

[1] Karl Barth, "The Church—The Living Congregation of the Living Lord Jesus Christ," included in *Man's Disorder and God's Design* (S.C.M. Press, 1948).

only among ourselves but among those in other churches who are looking towards reunion. They will know what manner of men and women we are and what we believe is given to us for a testimony. We exclude none who will walk with us or will show us a better way. We have never believed we know all mysteries and all knowledge, but what we see, we see, if only through a glass darkly, and we should be something less than ourselves to deny our vision.

* * *

THERE may be those who think that an International Congregational Council may become a hindrance to our contribution to the ecumenical movement, which under God is one of the great achievements of our time. But as yet that remains a movement of leaders, who to make it effective must take their churches with them. And a long process of education by word and work is required to extend our local ties without weakening them. If the International Council can win the interest and support of the national Unions throughout the world so that each will care for all and all for each, then we may hope and expect that this broadening concern will not stop short until it reaches the comprehensiveness of our Lord's own answer to the lawyer's question, And who is my neighbour?

But there are always two dangers; on the one hand, that our loyalty should be confined to our own church or parish or city, and on the other, that like the fool in *Proverbs,* our eyes should be in the ends of the earth to the neglect of the duty that lies at our door. A strong and vigorous Congregationalism—and that means Congregationalists who know what they believe and love what they know—can make an indispensable contribution to the Ecumenical Movement and to this troubled world, which is so desperately seeking a way of union which does not ignore the endless variety of human nature; a weak and nerveless Congregationalism, which has no confidence in itself, will merely lose itself without benefiting any. If, therefore, we of the stronger Unions can help our weaker brethren, weaker, we mean, in numbers, material resources and organization, then we do well, for as the Gospel itself was given to us to share with all men, so those insights and readings of God's purpose in Jesus Christ which distinguish us as Congregationalists were given to us not merely to secure and maintain our own freedom in Christ but to share with all those who are yet striving where we have already attained.

* * *

THIS newly-constituted Council is, of course, a venture of faith. Time will tell whether the work done at Wellesley is built upon a foundation of gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble.

The day shall declare it and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. When we were there together, it seemed inevitable as well as desirable that at a time when the Faith and its freedom are not only challenged but denied, we should put our trust in God and testify with one voice to what we know. It would surely be an intolerable thought that under the stress of present difficulties we were unable to keep what we had received and left our children to recover what we ourselves had lost.

* * *

WHAT great issues are even now being decided in the minds and hearts of men that will shortly emerge into the world of events! Sir Oliver Franks, in the paper we print, reminds us of the foundations of western civilization which are shaken. In Washington and in Strasbourg statesmen are gathered seeking to rediscover and adapt the fundamentals to the political life of a battered continent, the people of Germany are looking for a way back into the comity of the nations they have so grievously injured and Asia, freed from imperialism, is seeking firm ground on which to build. If Europe fails, is it likely that Asia will succeed? The signs are not all good. Thomas Mann, on his return from his first visit to Germany after sixteen years, expressed profound disappointment and other visitors say they are aware of the consciousness of a war lost rather than of a war begun. The Protestant Church is called to the desperately urgent task of summoning a continent to build its house upon the rock of God's revelation in Christ. If Europe can find a basis of free co-operative life that preserves its culture and advances its science, the whole world will be led into a new era of hope. If Europe fails, where can we look? Barth is right. In religion and politics the call is for responsible freedom. Neither in spiritual nor political tyranny can the soul of man find the springs of life.

* * *

A LITTLE book which ought not to be missed is *Two Memoirs* by J. M. Keynes (Rupert Hart-Davies, 7/6). The introduction explains that these alone of Keynes's unpublished papers are to be printed. How much of the detail of the real history of our times will therefore remain in manuscript no one but his literary executors knows. These two papers, written for a small dining club of intimate friends where there was no need for reticence, give us some of the observations and reflections of a first-rate intelligence, who while himself without political responsibility, was near enough to the great events which followed the first world war to see the statesmen and soldiers struggling with problems larger than they knew. The first paper has an account of the extraordinary scene in the Supreme Council when Lloyd George overwhelmed the French opposition to sending food to Germany and made a devastating attack upon the Jewish

French Minister of Finance. This is history as it will never be written. The second piece is even more interesting, because it reveals more of Keynes's own mind and throws an illuminating sidelight on what was happening to the intellectual generation that was growing to maturity in the early years of the century, the years when organized religion began to lose its hold upon some of the best of its own children. Keynes and his Cambridge friends came under the influence of G. E. Moore and Russell and so escaped, he thought, the Benthamite tradition, "the worm which has been gnawing at the insides of modern civilization and is responsible for its present moral decay". . . . "We used to regard the Christians as the enemy, because they appeared as the representatives of tradition, convention and hocus-pocus. In truth it was the Bentham calculus, based on an over-valuation of the economic criterion, which was destroying the quality of the popular ideal". He and his friends were in no danger from "the final *reductio ad absurdum* of Benthamism known as Marxism" but "we had completely failed to provide a substitute for these economic bogus faiths capable of protecting or satisfying our successors. . . . We repudiated all versions of the doctrine of original sin, of there being insane and irrational springs of wickedness in most men. We were not aware that civilization was a thin crust erected by the personality and the will of a very few . . ."

This paper was written on the eve of Munich.

Why did Keynes direct that only these two of his papers should be printed? Was it intended as a word of warning from one who now knew that out of the heart of man proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, thefts, false-witness, blasphemies, and that philosophies that know nothing of the heart are like Jonah's gourd that came up in a night and perished in a night?

* * *

A PAMPHLET, *Medicine Looks at Alcoholics Anonymous* (Works Publishing Inc., New York, 5c.) describes the remarkable work of a remarkable society of anonymous alcoholics now cured, part of whose cure is work with other alcoholics. The society began in 1934. It now has more than 750 groups with 24,000 members. It has the minimum of organization and no membership subscription. Small group meetings of 10-14 persons meet weekly and larger community meetings are also held. It is not a temperance society. It undertakes no crusade. It consists simply of men and women who were lost and are found. They know from tragic experience that they must never drink. They exist as a society to help themselves and others whose problem was and is their own. They give alcoholics understanding, confidence and companionship. Like the Church itself, they are a society of men and

women who know they need all they can do for themselves and one another and yet know that is not enough, and so turn expectantly to God.

Their method is very simple. The "Twelve Steps to Recovery" which have emerged out of experience, and which have been described by physicians and psychiatrists as good medicine and are certainly good religion, are condensed into five requirements:

1. The Alcoholic must admit his desperate situation and acknowledge that he needs help from outside.
2. He must analyse his personality.
3. He must adjust his personal relationships.
4. He must place his dependence upon a higher power, that is upon God.
5. He must work with other alcoholics.

Nearly 75 per cent of those who have tried this method are saved, and some of the failures, described as utterly hopeless cases, return to the society to make a more honest effort when they realize that they will die or go mad if they don't.

Chronic alcoholism is a disease for which scientific psychological treatment is needed but for which it is not enough. There are those for whom drink is spiritually and physically disastrous, whose families suffer with them, while doctors and psychiatrists too often stand helplessly by. Here is a simple technique of recovery—which is not to say it is easy, but it is always possible—which offers help to the helpless and shows the way to new and confident life. We commend this pamphlet to ministers and doctors and any over whom the shadow of the curse is cast.

* * *

A CORRESPONDENT to the *Manchester Guardian* has a warning for all who speak to children.

A visiting teacher from the county town was giving a lesson on "Wool" to a class of nine-year-olds in an upland farm area. She pinned up a large coloured picture of a sheep and remarked brightly, "Now I am sure you all know what this is".

There was no response to her implied question. When she repeated it rather more vigorously, one impassive youth asked if he might see the picture nearer at hand. On permission being given, he examined it closely and then hazarded, "It's a two-year-old Border Leicester, isn't it?"

THE TRADITION OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

By Sir Oliver Franks

My title to speak to you is really that my father, grandfather and three uncles have all been Congregational ministers. I was brought up in the Congregational tradition and my boyhood was spent on the campus of a theological training college for Congregational ministers of which my father was the Principal.

When I look back two things seem to me to stand out from the traditions and the teaching I absorbed. Congregationalism, it seems to me, lays a particular emphasis on the responsibility of the individual in religion and gives an ethical interpretation to the relationship of God and man and consequently to that of man with man. I do not of course mean that these beliefs are in any way special to Congregationalists among Christians. That would be quite untrue. But it has always seemed to me that the tradition in which I grew up laid a consistent and perceptible emphasis on these beliefs.

The Congregationalist, I think, has not usually been so otherwordly in his outlook as to see in this life no more than a doleful pilgrimage. He has remembered the striking affirmation in the first chapter of Genesis where, after the creation of the world has been described, it is said that "God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good". He has believed that the world was full of opportunities to realize the good life and he has interpreted that love of God, which is enjoined upon him, as requiring for its full expression a relationship to his neighbours which in its active quality reflected, so far as was possible, the same outflowing of the personality and soul. He has not pushed the arguments of the *Via Negativa* so far as to lose sight of another ancient element in the Christian tradition, that men were created in the image of God.

In this way there has resulted a natural, though not at all exclusive, emphasis on the freedom and responsibility of the individual Christian in this world. He has things to do in it, opportunities to grasp and ideals to realize. He can choose whether he will so act. He is free to try to live up to his tradition and beliefs or to refuse. He can ask to be upheld in his endeavour by Divine Grace or he can close the avenues of his spirit. He carries about with him under God a responsibility for what he tries to make of himself and his relationships to his fellows.

For these reasons it might be of interest to look for a few minutes at those broader traditions of Western civilization which inform our minds and see how far they allow for such an attitude to life.

We who are citizens of the United States or of Great Britain are conscious that we are inheritors of the Western tradition. This tradition is old; its roots go back to Jerusalem, Athens and Rome. A civilization has grown out of it, deriving its original inspiration from the ancient civilizations which flourished round the shores of the Mediterranean. We are all members of this Western civilization and in recent years we have become increasingly conscious of the fact.

Our civilization is not very old. By comparison with the life of men on the earth it is very young indeed. It is youthful even in relation to that short period of the story of mankind which falls within recorded history. It is an affair of the last 400 years. Yet, if young, it has had more than the usual share of the vigour of youth. Its impact upon the whole world has been far greater than that of any other civilization. In all other periods of human history of which we have knowledge, the peoples of the world, while in touch with their neighbours, knew little or nothing of life in continents other than their own.

At a time when the Roman Empire was at its height and, to its citizens, seemed to gather within its borders all the peoples of the known world, there existed in the East a great Chinese Empire which similarly gathered many peoples within its borders and seemed to span the inhabited world. These two great empires existed side by side. They had no relations or contacts with each other. The most that ever happened was a whisper borne on travellers' tales that there might be another centre of life and civilization far away.

Until the emergence of Western civilization our one world was many worlds to the peoples who lived in it. It is the peoples of the Western tradition who, in the last few centuries, have made it, from the points of view of all the peoples who live in it, irrevocably, for better or worse, one world.

The process started with the great voyages of discovery of the Portuguese and the Spaniards. It was continued by the French, the Dutch and the British. The seaways of the worlds were opened up and trade began to move between all five continents. And then the inventive genius of our civilization discovered new means of communication and transport so that today we all live together in the same world. The radio and the aeroplane have brought the ends of the earth into contact; men, ideas and things can be transported in a matter of days from America to Asia or to Europe.

What is the special quality of our civilization which has so

altered the relationships of the peoples of the world? A civilization is not an easy thing to define or describe. On the contrary, it is complex and elusive; a complete way of life instinct with many traditions of the past which live on in it, and built up from many interests, beliefs and practices which by their inter-play create its peculiar flavour and quality.

There is one mark, however, which it is comparatively easy to recognize and identify. Almost all other civilizations have looked at the future with one of two beliefs in mind. The first belief is that the golden age of man lies in the past. The aspect of the future must arouse melancholy, for it holds no promise of anything but stages of life further removed from the past ideal. Such a view is common in the literature of the ancient world. It is found in Hesiod, whose picture of history is a retrogression from the age of gold to the age of iron. Listen to Horace: "What a race the golden sires have left, worse than their fathers, and their offspring will be baser still". It is found even in the beginnings of the Modern Age, as when, for example, Rousseau harks back to the life of the noble savage, distinguished in its simplicity and worth from later forms of society.

The second belief sees the history of man as cycles of growth and decline. Any society, mankind as a whole, even the whole inhabited universe, comes into being, matures and decays. The pulse of the universe beats in an alternate expansion and contraction. History endlessly repeats itself. That which hath been is that which shall be. This view, too, is common. It echoes down Western tradition ever since it was put forward by Virgil, who thought that with Augustus the great age of gold returned.

Western civilization has never believed either that the future must be worse than the present or that the future must be a repetition of the past. It has never viewed the future with sadness or with resignation. Its mark is hope. We believe that the future can be better than the present; that what men do can affect their prospects. The world in which men live and work is of such a nature that it is reasonable to look forward with confidence and to back that confidence with enterprise. Because it has been hopeful, Western civilization has also been restless and dynamic. Change could be for the better; it was man's business to make it so.

This note of hope derives from the beliefs of the Middle Ages from which Western civilization sprang. The Middle Ages, too, were hopeful, though not about this world. In those centuries men rested their hopes upon a future state of happiness beyond this world. Their hope was a religious hope. The very use of language by the great masters of mediaeval thought bears witness to this belief. When they spoke of man and his destiny, they called

him "viator", the traveller whose goal reached beyond the confines of this life. Their concern was with the duties of the traveller and how he might best prepare himself as he made his journey for the life that lay beyond it.

Nor was this belief confined to the learned. At the beginning of the Modern Age it received immortal embodiment in the writings of a tinker. John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* sets down the trials of a pilgrim as he travels, and yet it is full of hope, as all who have read the immortal allegory know. Every chapter of the *Pilgrim's Progress* is vibrant with hope, but this world seems a valley of shadows, full of perils: true happiness lies beyond the celestial gates.

It is characteristic of our civilization that it has extended the notions of hope and confidence to men's dealings with this world. Both in the relation of man to nature and in the relations of men to each other, improvement is possible and attainable. It is not often remembered that the idea of progress is a comparatively new idea in the history of thought. It first came into existence about 200 years ago. Today we are apt to take it for granted. We argue about progress; we hold differing views about what constitutes progress; we are pleased or disappointed with the amount of progress made in any particular direction. But we normally and naturally assume that progress is possible.

It is the element of hope and confidence which has made it possible for the idea of progress to arise. It is true that the reality of progress is at times more unquestioningly accepted than at others. When the first World War broke out in 1914 my father was approximately the age that I am now. Contrast for a moment the 40 odd years through which he had lived with those that have been my lot. He lived in England under the reigns of Queen Victoria and King Edward VII. No great war marred the succession of the years. Material wealth seemed steadily to increase. It seemed reasonable to suppose that health and happiness were steadily increasing too. The order of society seemed to become increasingly stable and pacific. The nations had largely learned to settle their problems without recourse to war. In short, it was a progressive age. To doubt the reality of progress was unreasonable.

In my own lifetime I have lived through two great world wars. I have also experienced the great depression of the early 1930's and the troubled uncertainties of these post-war years. My 40 years' view is very different from that of my father. It is not nearly so easy for me to assume that progress has its automatic yearly increments. It is not as clear as it seemed a generation ago that human society is steadily improving in the methods by which it solves its problems.

Yet, though by contrast I am not so sure about the reality of progress; though I am much more open to argument about what real progress consists in; though I think of progress in human society as something to be achieved painfully and with effort rather than coming almost unsought; I believe with my father that progress is possible and that it is worth human effort and human work to achieve it. Western civilization has received severe jolts in the 20th century, but because it is Western civilization, it still has hope and confidence about the future. It still believes men can progress if they will.

In the hard school of experience the 20th century has learned what the 19th century was in danger of forgetting, that progress is not automatic. In the 19th century men in their over-confidence proclaimed an inevitable law of progress. Huxley said: "Progress is not an accident but a necessity", and Herschel announced: "Man's progress towards a higher state need never fear a check but must continue till the very last existence of history". Our Victorian grandparents often muddled up progress with evolution. They often failed to see that the survival of the fittest did not necessarily mean the survival of the useful or the good; they confused a scientific theory with a non-existent metaphysical law.

Why should it have become reasonable for men to believe in progress? What further condition made it possible for the peoples of Western civilization to extend that hope and confidence about the ultimate destiny of mankind, which they inherited from their mediaeval forefathers, to the actual processes of living here in this world? At this point there emerges another mark. It is this civilization which has given birth to the industrial revolution.

We have only to look beyond the modern age to see how vast that revolution has been. Before it, men had inventions such as the use of the wheel, the controlled use of fire, and the making of metals and tools. Now, new sources of power never before dreamt of have been harnessed to the needs of men; coal, oil, electricity and soon, we are told, there will be atomic energy.

With these new sources of power at their disposal men have devised machines which in numberless ways multiply the productivity of human effort. As a result our whole way of life has been changed. Our great cities with their elaborate services of light, heat, water and sanitation are products of the industrial revolution. So, too, are the new means of transport and communication which have shrunk the whole circumference of the globe to the dimensions of a short journey.

This is the industrial revolution, which has opened up the prospect that, through the increase of the means of living, a fuller and more satisfying life can be found. The industrial revolution

forged the instruments which are the conditions of the possibility of progress.

There is a difference between the conditions of progress and progress. The existence of the conditions is no guarantee of the existence of what they make possible. The astonishing increase in material wealth in the last two hundred years and the transformation of human living this increase has brought with it have often blinded men to this fact. They have been tempted to identify material development with progress and to see in each scientific discovery, its technical application and proved utility, evidence that human society is progressing. They have fallen into the state of mind satirized by Disraeli in his cool, ironical way: "The European talks of progress because by the aid of a few scientific discoveries he has established a society which has mistaken comfort for civilization".

The very closeness of the connection between the material conditions of progress and progress itself makes a false identification easy. One of the ways in which we should all believe that there has been progress in the countries of Western civilization in the last 150 years has been in the spread of responsible democratic government, not just in the sense that the number of peoples who have adopted and practised constitutional democracy has increased, but much more that in our countries the base of democratic responsibility and decision has been broadened to include virtually the whole adult population. For the first time in history it has been possible for the people as a whole to have an effective voice in government and to grow in dignity, responsibility and freedom.

But this real progress that the Western democracies have made is not solely due to their increasing insight into the worth and dignity of the individual. It has been made possible by the tools and services provided by the industrial revolution. Full democracy presupposes a number of things we nowadays take for granted. It involves a certain standard of literacy; a certain ability to decide; a reasonably rapid and accurate service of information and news; the dissemination of responsible opinion. In a word, it involves a certain standard of living.

The false identification of progress with material development conflicts with the basic beliefs on which Western civilization has been built. All the ingenious inventions of the modern age and their development to the stage of large-scale production, with all the techniques and skills that lie behind them are there for the use of man. He can decide whether he will use or abuse them; turn them to construction or to destruction; devote them to peace or war. The things and the machines we have created since the industrial revolution express the control men have won over nature.

They represent the power of men over their surroundings, and power by itself is not progress.

Suppose that in a whole society men believed in nothing but things, their possession, and the power that the possession of things gives. That society would be a materialistic society and it would have, in the ultimate, no purposes in life beyond the increase of its power. Something very like that happened in the terrible régime of Hitler over Germany. A whole country devoted itself to materialism and the pursuit of power, and looked upon its neighbours simply as means to aggrandisement of power. The men and women of the surrounding countries became mere units to be used or discarded ruthlessly as was expedient to those in power.

The belief in power for its own sake is no part of Western tradition. The relation of power to progress depends upon the use made of it. The standards of Western civilization require that progress should be judged by the extent to which men use their possessions and their power to realize and express their hope and confidence in the world. What is the source of that hope and confidence? It derives, I think, in the end, from a religious view of the universe.

Men can have hope for the future and confidence in their activities in the world only if they also believe that the universe is not indifferent to man and his efforts. It must have a character such that what he does can make a difference and is not a meaningless scribble on the sands of time. It must be possible for his activities to have a significance in the sum of things. But if this is the case, the world in which he lives and acts is so constituted that it does not frustrate the use of his faculties.

What is involved in such a belief about man's relation to his environment? When he tries to acquire knowledge of it, he is not stopped short by its sheer unintelligibility. When he tries to create beauty, he is not frustrated by the irredeemable chaos and disorder of what he encounters. When he pursues happiness and goodness, he is not prevented from the realization of his ideals by the intractable indifference of his surroundings.

We have hope because we believe that in this world it is possible through human effort to gain knowledge, create beauty and realize the good. It is a condition of the hope and confidence which characterize Western civilization that the constitution of the universe includes those values by which men think, create and act. Belief in progress ultimately depends on the religious view of the Christian tradition.

It is therefore completely excluded by that other philosophy, so dramatically expressed by Bertrand Russell, of man alone in an alien and inhuman world, alone among hostile forces. "That

man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought or feeling, can preserve an individual beyond the grave; that all the labours of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and that the whole temple of man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the débris of a universe in ruins—all these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain, that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand". That is the religion of hopelessness, a religion to which Western civilization with its hope for the future and its belief in the possibility of progress can never give its allegiance.

In these remarks I have not nearly exhausted the content of the great civilization we have inherited. I have not tried to give you a full delineation of its character. My attempt has been to expose two or three of the fundamental ideas which inform it, to describe them and trace their relationships, for it is these ideas, as they have become beliefs and as the beliefs have issued in action, which have sustained and nourished the astonishing performance of our Western peoples over the last four centuries. They are still active today, as you may see from the preamble of the Atlantic Pact. It is now our turn to carry forward the tradition and build further on what we have inherited. If we are to do this effectively we must understand the tradition and appreciate the inheritance. Western civilization was created and has progressed through intelligent effort. This in turn is now required of us.

In the last resort our outlook on life depends upon a religious insight. In this regard I believe that Congregationalism has a contribution to make. The emphasis it lays on the responsibility of the individual in religion means that each member of the Congregational Churches must attempt to find his way to that insight, deepen it and use it as the ultimate standard and touchstone of thought and conduct in social life. No one can take that responsibility from him, though others can help him to see it more clearly. He will conceive of his fellows as created in the same image as himself and therefore judge his behaviour to them by the values expressed and revealed in the Gospels. He will believe that religion and life are not separate and that life takes on its real significance only as inspired and illumined by religion.

THE CHURCH'S WITNESS TO GOD'S DESIGN

By the Rev. Truman B. Douglass, D.D.

It was Martin Luther, I believe, who once remarked concerning some literary efforts of King Henry VIII that when the Lord God wishes to make a perfect fool he sets a king to writing on theology. That was in the sixteenth century, and in that primitive age the Lord was restricted to the use of imperfect, even crude, vehicles for manifesting the divine jocularity. He had nothing better than kings of which to make fools. He had not yet shown what could be done by arousing the theological itch in advertising executives, newspaper columnists, and novelists of the *haute monde* who suddenly develop an interest in mysticism.

Doubtless this peril of provoking the divine levity (to say nothing of human derision) stands over any amateur who ventures into territory where only the technically proficient—those who make the refinement and the precise statement of theological concepts their main business in life—really know their way around.

There is another difficulty, beyond the consciousness of technical deficiency, of which one is aware in addressing oneself to the subject of the Church's witness. In the present highly controversial state of Christian thought, no interpretation seems worthy of attention except it wear the badge of some "neo" theology. One must be neo-orthodox, or neo-Protestant, or neo-Calvinist, or neo-Thomist, or neo-something-else. In my own case, so far as I am aware, I am not an orthodox adherent to any orthodox school of neo-orthodoxy. I am just a theological neo-phyte, trying to understand the meaning of the Christian Gospel, the content of the Christian Evangel—and, on the basis of this and as one associated with the missionary work of the Church, attempting to know something about the character of the Christian mission in our time.

A further obstacle—and here we come to a more serious matter—which one confronts if one is so foolhardy as to hope to say anything fresh or original about the Church's witness, arises from the fact that this theme has become in recent years the central preoccupation of the most powerful minds in the Church. The subject of evangelism is no longer a peripheral interest; nor merely one among several of the Church's functions having approximately the same degree of importance; nor is it—this least of all—the hobby of some coterie bent upon advocating this or that technique of evangelization. Every front-rank Christian thinker of our time is grappling with this issue. It has been the sovereign theme at the great

ecumenical gatherings. (This was quite as true of Madras as of Amsterdam.) To what does the Church bear witness, and how can it make its declaration with greater fidelity, adequacy, and power?

As Amsterdam puts it:

> If the Gospel really is a matter of life and death, it seems intolerable that any human being now in the world should live out his life without ever having the chance to hear and receive it. . . . The evident demand of God is that the whole Church should set itself to the total task of winning the whole world for Christ. . . . The duty of the Church can be expressed simply in one sentence—it is required to be faithful to the Gospel and to realize more fully its own nature as the Church. But fulfilment of this duty involves a revolution in thought and practice.—(Report of Section II, Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council of Churches.)

I

I should like to devote the major portion of this statement to outlining what seems to be the central problem for the witnessing Church in our time, and indicating the responsibility which it presents to Congregationalism. Before doing this, however, let me offer two preliminary observations, which must be put forward briefly and almost dogmatically.

First, there is need for a candid and forthright recognition of the polemical situation in which the Church makes its testimony today. In few places in the world, if in any, is the evangelistic task one of commending Christianity to persons who are religiously neutral, or for whom the decision is between the Christian faith and no faith. We have learned in tragic and dreadful ways that what Emil Brunner calls "the dimension of the absolute" in men's spirits does not remain unoccupied, and that there are other candidates for occupancy beside the Christian faith. The Church confronts alternative faiths and anti-faiths—movements which claim to offer an interpretation of the meaning and destiny of human existence and which are vigorously contending for the allegiance of men.

The existence of such rival, militant faiths exposes the folly of an attitude of theological irresponsibility which has characterized too much of Protestantism. Each of these contending movements has a doctrine, and this doctrine is part of the secret of its dynamism. It is led by a corps of adherents who know what they believe. We Christians had better know what we believe, or the next period in human history is going to be taken over by people who do.

In the second place, the churches are beginning to understand that the mandate to witness is essentially the same mandate everywhere in the world. In whatever land they carry on their work, seeking to make the Gospel known, they are all in what is really a missionary situation, set as a minority in the midst of an alien and often hostile culture. This fact is one of the deep-running,

uncalculated forces impelling the churches toward unity. They are coming to realize not only that their witness is disastrously weakened by their disunity (which is certainly not difficult to see), but that they are actually already at one everywhere in the world in their position with respect to the surrounding culture. The churches in Britain and America, facing their task of evangelism, can probably learn more from the churches in the Orient and in Africa than from their own history and experience during the period when in Western society there was something which could be called "Christendom".

The editor of the second volume in the Amsterdam Series has called attention to one notable feature of the studies which preceded the Amsterdam Assembly. He observes that for the first time in the modern era a great ecumenical gathering has recognized that the problems of proclaiming the Gospel in the East and in the West are fundamentally the same—that the distinctions which once differentiated the evangelistic programme and methods of the so-called younger churches from those of the churches in the Western world are out of date. Neither in the East nor in the West is there today a *Corpus Christianum,* a general Christian culture, with which the *Corpus Christi,* the Church, may establish reciprocal relations. Everywhere in the world the Church confronts once again the characteristic apostolic situation.

Doubtless this thesis can be pressed too far, for there are important differences between the position of the Church in lands where Christianity has been proclaimed for many centuries and the countries to which it has come quite recently. Indeed, in some respects the task of the Church is more baffling in the nations where its presence is generally accepted.

Mr. T. S. Eliot somewhere remarks upon the ambiguous position of the Church in the Western world—where, he says, we do not have a Christian society, nor a pagan society, but a *neutral* society, in which the practice of Christianity is tolerated.

> "I am not concerned", says Mr. Eliot, "with the problems of Christians as a persecuted minority. When the Christian is treated as an enemy of the State, his course is very much harder, but it is simpler. I am concerned with the dangers to a tolerated minority; and in the modern world it may turn out that the most intolerable thing is to be tolerated".[1]

I believe Mr. Eliot exaggerates the religious neutrality of the Western nations. Certainly the area of toleration is rapidly being reduced. But the point he makes is a suggestive one. It may be that this remark betrays a home missions bias, but I am bound to say that the task of the Church in some of our communities in the United States seems to me more exacting in some respects than in the so-called non-Christian lands. This for two reasons.

[1] *The Idea of a Christian Society,* p. 23.

First, the mission of the Church in a place where Christ is not known—in a society which makes no claim to having any relationship to the Christian tradition—is relatively simple, however much hardship it may entail. Its strategy can be direct and uncomplicated. But when the Church confronts a society which claims a Christian sanction for ways of thought and life which are diametrically opposed to the Christian faith and ethic, then its strategic planning must be more adroit. It has to penetrate that deeper darkening of the mind which is present when men profoundly deceive themselves about their own predicament. Before it can undertake the positive work of presenting the Christian faith, it has to break through the strong defences of pseudo-Christianity.

Secondly, the Church in its witness in the Western World faces peculiar difficulties because there is a difference between a non-Christian culture and a de-Christianized culture. There is a difference in mood and in ways of responding to the Gospel between persons who are hearing the Gospel as news for the first time and those who hear it both as news and as a reminder of something heard before. There is a difference between the person to whom the Gospel comes as a Word so wonderful that he can scarcely believe it, and the person to whom it comes as something he once believed, or half-believed, and then rejected. With the latter person, resistance to the Gospel is complicated at least by a dim awareness of infidelity. He turns away with a consciousness of guilt and a kind of fury of rejection which the non-Christian does not feel.

This suggests the peculiar difficulty with which the Churches of the West have to deal in witnessing to the Christian faith. Our western culture embodies in many of its ways of thought, its standards and its institutions, the remembrance that it once *was* Christendom. And it looks upon a Church, which proclaims the Gospel in its fulness, not merely as the bringer of news so good as to be incredible, but also as the source of painful reminders of its own apostasy. The special resistance which the older Churches meet in their witnessing is due to the fact that western society has actually confronted the Cross of Christ, and has decided—almost by a deliberate act of judgment—that it is an offence.

II

This brings us to what I think must be regarded as the central problem of evangelism, of the witnessing Church. The Church, commissioned to proclaim the Word of God, faces a dilemma. On the one side it knows that nothing less than the whole Gospel, in all its drastic newness and revolutionary power, is sufficient for dealing with our human predicament. On the other side, the Church knows that the full Gospel comes to men as a scandal and an offence. This has always been so, but perhaps never more acutely so than in our own time; for the Christian faith deals violently, one after another,

with all the cherished presuppositions by which modern man lives.

"The strange new world within the Bible", of which Karl Barth wrote, is not only strange and new; it is repellent in its strangeness and novelty. It is not a world in which the final and most important truth is of a sort which smart men can think up for themselves. This truth is not the last term in a logical system, nor the answer to a series of progressively more intelligent questions which men have been learning to ask about their existence. It is not the answer to our best human hopes. The Gospel first came as the fulfilment of ancient hopes, but it was an utterly surprising fulfilment. It was not a natural "emergent"; indeed, it was so *un*natural that it was rejected by the official custodians of the traditional expectations.

What a scandalous business this Christian proclamation is when viewed from the assumptions of the contemporary world! How it offends and threatens all the secure bases of thought and action!

It begins with what the theologians call "the scandal of particularity". For the modern mind, all significant knowledge tends toward the abstract and the general; but the Christian faith is stubbornly—almost mercilessly—preoccupied with the concrete and the particular. And what absurd particulars!

One Book, the Bible—this, amid all the world's vast literature, uniquely confronting us with the Word of God! One people, one nation, one succession of events, limited in space and time, occurring far out on the periphery of secular history, yet the chosen medium for disclosing God's will and way with a fulness not approached elsewhere in all the world's story! One atoning act, of which we must say that while men are never without evidences of God's mercy, in this event alone He offers His very Self in all His redemptive grace and love! One Community of Redemption, the Church—miserable in its weakness, its sinfulness, and its apostasy, yet the organ of Christ's activity in the world—His Body! These things are scandalous.

There is the scandal of the Gospel's attack upon our autonomy and self-sufficiency. It is offensive to be reminded that we are creatures and not creators, and that the meaning of life is to be found in a freedom which is ultimately obedience. It is outrageous to be told that our life is not our own to do with as we please—that it was purchased for us and it is owed.

There is the two-fold scandal of forgiveness: first, the shattering acknowledgment that we need to be forgiven; second, the incredible truth that we *can* be forgiven—that forgiveness is possible in the radical sense in which the Gospel offers it: forgiveness not only for what we have done and have left undone, but for what we are.

Now when the Church is realistic in facing its evangelistic task, it does it with the foreknowledge that its witness, if it be given faithfully, will have this offensive, outrageous quality. It repels as it

woos; it alienates as it persuades. There is no trick of evangelistic technique which can enable us to by-pass this dilemma. The only ultimately effective agency of evangelism, apart from the miraculous work of the Holy Spirit Himself, is the power to convince and convict and persuade and possess, which inheres in the truth made known to us in our Lord Jesus Christ. But this truth does its work radically, smashing man's illusions and shattering his self-esteem and self-reliance. In short, the God who encounters us in Jesus Christ is One whose mercy is not known apart from His judgment.

We have said enough, perhaps, to indicate the primary problem with which the witnessing Church must come to terms. As one of the papers prepared for Amsterdam puts the issue:

> It is obvious that the task of evangelism has its perils. The Church, by loyal faithfulness to what it has received, may make its message meaningless. (On the other hand), by excessive concern for the contemporary relevance of its utterance, it may be betrayed into unfaithfulness to the Gospel of God's judgment and God's mercy. . . . The problem of evangelism is just the perpetual rediscovery of the narrow way on which alone the Church can be true to its two-fold vocation of faithfulness to God and service to His creatures.[2]

III

In the time that remains to me I should like to say something about the responsibility of the churches of our order in pursuing this two-fold vocation of the witnessing Church. What does a confronting of this problem of communicating the message of the Gospel to the life of our time mean for our fellowship?

1. First of all, we have a responsibility for stating clearly where we stand with respect to the central truths of our holy faith. To what do we Congregationalists bear witness? Is it the faith by which it lives today when it is truly the living Church, or is it some variant or corruption of that faith which seems more plausible and acceptable in the eyes of men?

This is something more than an oratorical question. It is one to which Congregationalism has not always and everywhere given an unambiguous answer. The peril described in the Amsterdam paper quoted a moment ago is more than ordinarily acute for the Congregational churches.

For one thing, we do not have the obvious regulative norms of credal or rubrical uniformity. Furthermore, we have traditionally felt an obligation not merely to proclaim the faith but to communicate it—to bring it home to men's minds and hearts and consciences. This is both a high tradition and a perilous one. It has made Congregationalism a vigorously confessional fellowship—not as we sometimes say, a "creedless" community, but amazingly fecund in its production of creeds, always striving to give its testimony in

[2] *The Amsterdam Assembly Series*, Vol. 2, p. 201.

living speech, understandable by those to whom it is addressed. The peril lies in the tendency of a witness which is colloquial and contemporaneous to become something less than Christian. The radical character of the Gospel, in all its supernatural givenness, is replaced by some form of idealism or moralism.

I do not know how it is elsewhere, and I speak only from the perspective of Protestantism in the United States, but one is bound to note that, with us, the churches which make the widest popular appeal are generally those which proclaim some type of legalism, or which have debased the Gospel to some variation upon the enormously popular theme, "God Can Help You Relax". Christianity becomes a sort of mental exercise for the relief of nervous tension. This state of affairs is not entirely a commentary upon the lack of discrimination in the popular mind. It is due in part to the lack of readily available alternatives. On the one side, it is evident that a legalistic version of Christianity, phrased in the shabby stereotypes, has nothing to say to great multitudes of our contemporaries. On the other hand, concerning some of the churches which have rejected the time worn formulæ, it may be asked whether, with all their intelligibility, they have anything to say that is worth hearing. Has the Church anything to say to youth beyond advising it to "follow the gleam?" Has it anything to say to man in his tragedy and sin beyond a cheery moralizing which combines the more high-sounding and fatuous sentiments of Henley's *Invictus* and Kipling's *If*? Has it anything to say concerning the meaning and end of human history, save that if we manage to escape being atomized in the next few years, then, perhaps, if we work hard enough and fill our minds with good-will and all pull together, we can make this world a pretty nice place after all?

This is admittedly a caricature; but in the degree that it has any verisimilitude, it reminds us that when the Church accommodates its message to the prevalent expectation, it no longer has a Gospel. It says to man nothing that he is not already capable of saying to himself—and finds extremely dull in endless reiteration.

Let it be said, without reservation, that concerning the central truths of the Gospel, we have no separate Congregational witness. Perhaps our greatest distinction is that in matters of faith we claim no distinction. More than once in this Council we have heard words from Bernard Lord Manning. Let him speak to us again on this issue:

> Congregationalists . . . have no peculiar theological doctrines of their own. They stand in the central line of dogmatic teaching. . . . With St. Ignatius and with all saints Congregationalists confess, 'Our charter is Jesus Christ; our infallible charter is His cross, His death, and His passion, and faith through Him'. Congregationalists yield to no man in their

> claim to be catholics. They bless the same Name and live by the same food as the other members of the church of God. Congregationalism exists to give the same saving doctrine to the world. (*Essays in Orthodox Dissent,* pp. 158-159.)

What Manning has said to this Council, let the Council say to the Churches. Our witness—and the only witness which can reach to man's desperation and tragedy—is the whole Gospel, which has power to shatter the human heart with wonder and shake the world with hope.

2. Secondly: recognizing what I have called "the polemical situation" in which the Church is involved—confronting the claims of alternative faiths which assert that they have the answer for man's most clamant needs—Congregationalists have a responsibility for meeting these contenders in the forum of contemporary thought, and presenting the Christian understanding of life in ways that are more penetrating and relevant than the message of these competing "gospels". Here the mood of more attentive and more serious listening to the word of the Bible—a mood in which Congregationalists are sharing—becomes a new resource. We are discovering anew that concerning the ultimate issues of our life, the message of the Bible is always different, and is always more profound and adequate, than any of the alternative interpretations.

The acceptance of this responsibility for meeting the polemical issue means that the Church must more vigorously and skilfully attack some of the key positions in modern society—the university community, and even the quite self-conscious groups of the intellectual élite, where ideas that profoundly influence the direction of our culture are being shaped.

In the exciting work of theological reconstruction now going on, Congregationalists are performing a service wholly disproportionate to their size in the Protestant community. It is worthy of note that in the United States the now-approved union of the Congregational Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church will bring into one fellowship an extraordinary company of the theological leaders of this country: Bennett, Ferré, Reinhold and Richard Niebuhr, Tillich, Calhoun, Horton (two of them), Muilenburg, Brunner, Pauck—so on. I do not venture to call the roll for other sections of Congregationalism, for fear of omissions. To select a single name, I would say that the rediscovery of P. T. Forsyth—his mind so amazingly modern in the best sense of that word—may be as momentous for the quickening of Christian thought as the return of Kirkegaard after a century of obscurity. But this responsibility for meeting the challenge of competing faiths forensically cannot be shifted entirely to the theologians. What

they are helping the Church to say with new vigour needs to be mediated. The Church requires a ministry which will address itself more seriously to the problem of communication.

Beyond this, we are called to recognize what is implicit in Congregationalism—that evangelism is the task of the whole Church.

> "The lay apostolate", said Amsterdam, "is the hope of the Church in the modern world. . . . We begin to understand that the vast multitude of lay-members of the churches is the greatest potential force the churches, humanly speaking, have, in carrying out their commission to witness to the power of salvation and renewal of life that is in Jesus Christ".[3]

What Amsterdam has said in this matter, Congregationalists ought always to have known and never forgotten. In the contest of faiths, the lay members of our churches have the best opportunity of meeting the issue at the point of men's immediate questionings and in the midst of their ordinary employments. There is need of a summons to the whole Church to fit itself for this ministry. And this means a more serious dealing with the fact that the Christian faith has a definite content—and that it requires for its understanding at least as much attention as one would give to a reading of the morning newspaper or the declaring of a hand at bridge!

3. Thirdly, it must be remembered in humility and contrition that the witness of the Church to God's Design can never be dissociated from the quality of the Church's own life and action in the world. For the Church is not only created by the Gospel, not only a means of proclaiming the Gospel, but is also *a part of* the Gospel. It is the objective evidence of the Resurrection. This New Community, in which the hostilities of nature and history are overcome by God's reconciling action in Christ, this Redeemed Society, in which men are brought out of the death of ultimate futility and despair into the new life of thankful trust in God's sovereign mercy —this Church is itself a part of the good news of the Gospel, a setting forth of God's Design. In its own life and action the Church is called to declare the living Christ's present activity.

The witness of the Church is not an expression of religious opinion, not an exercise in philosophical reasoning, not an exposition of the "ideal" for human life and society. That to which the Church bears witness is "eventful" through and through. We testify to something *done*. God has *acted* for man's redemption, and it is the news of this event which the Church is called to proclaim.

But the Church cannot testify truly unless its own life is, so to say, "eventful"—unless it shows some authentic signs of having received God's gracious gift in Christ and of possessing a new and

[3] *The Amsterdam Assembly Series*, Vol. 2, pp. 204, 17.

ever-renewed life, which quickens all its members. The pallid, joyless, and low-energy character of many churches is a denial of everything they say. As Amsterdam declared: "The greatest contribution the Church can make to the renewal of society is that it should be renewed in its own life, in faith and obedience to its Lord". And to this we may add that the clearest evidence of renewal in faith and obedience is a Church in which the meaning of that action on Calvary is transmitted through the Community of Believers which in turn *acts* its wondering love and praise. The Cross, with its drastic repudiation of every form of self-trust, will always be a scandal and an affront to the world. It is only as the fellowship which has been gathered and brought into being at the foot of the Cross shows that it has received the power of a new life that the offence can be overcome.

In classical Congregationalism this is well understood. A fellowship, which has traditionally recognized its responsibility for acting in society, has never regarded its action as merely one of the numerous efforts to improve the social order. The Church's demand for justice, its attack upon corporate and individual practices which hold human beings in oppression or contempt, its ministries of mercy—these are understood as a part of its witness. They are the characteristic acts of the Fellowship of Agape—the redeemed community which, because it has learned that the meaning of life is not in man but in Christ, has been liberated from the bondage of self-obsession and in the joy and peace of the Gospel set free to offer itself in love.

But this newness of life, which authenticates the Church's declaration, does not come to the Church through however much eagerness of longing and high resolve. Something else is required.

I close with a word from Dr. Forsyth. Is the need of the Church, he asks, for what we so lightly call "the deepening of personal religion"? And he answers "No".

> It is something much more that we need. We need the humiliation in which we forget about religion, the faith in which we forget about either faith or works, the sanctity that has no knowledge of its own holiness. We need an experience of Christ in which we think everything about Christ and nothing about the experience. We need that preachers shall not keep demanding either a faith or a love that we cannot rise to, but shall preach a Christ that produces and compels both. And we need that the Christ we shall preach shall not be our brother, ideal, or King only, but also our judge. . . . We can never fully say "My brother!" till we have heartily said "My God"; and we can never heartily say "My God" until we have humbly said "My guilt!" That is the root of moral reality, of personal religion, and social security.[4]

[4] *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* pp. 133-134.

NO CONTINUING CITY

By H. J. Heering, D.D.

The Amsterdam report on the Church and the Disorder of Society is most important; its lack of echo is distressing. It ought to be my duty to make it alive again to our meeting. I'll try to do so, starting from eight paradoxical statements.

1. *Christianity is the most social religion.*
   Christianity is the most individual religion.

The first statement is clear to you, I think. But you know it is not to all our church members. At least it is not in Holland. There they quite agreed that during the German oppression the churches stood for justice and liberty. But many were quite upset when the churches continued this line after the opposition was beaten and when some of those churches opposed the military action in Indonesia. Many churchgoers object to politics in the pulpit; in my congregation hundreds stay away for this very reason. Still we must explain to them patiently that Biblical religion is in this respect radically opposed to the Indian religions with their individualism: the Bible is concerned with the world, with justice and peace, with the neighbour and the foreigner. Moreover, it is not only some backward church members who lag behind, but also many of our churches themselves. Dorothy Sayers was right in saying that the churches always have been denouncing what she calls the "warm sins" of adultery, theft and the like, keeping their eyes off the much more dangerous "cold sins"; and the cold sins are the social sins which we rarely tackle. You all will agree that the Church has to tackle them. And we gratefully welcome the social awakening caused by the Ecumenical Movement.

And still—Christianity is the most individual religion. It permits no taking shelter behind your neighbour, your nation, your State, or public opinion. It was one of the mistakes of Walter Rauschenbusch, when he wrote his famous "A Theology of the Social Gospel" that he failed to take the individual sufficiently into account. Christianity can never forget that the deepest connection between God and man is the individual one. God's word was incarnated in a man, not in a nation or in mankind. The deepest need of man is quite personal. Nazism failed because it handled the individual as *quantité négligeable*. Communism will fail for the same reason. And Capitalism?

Christianity will always break holes in any system which keeps the individual down. In the words of the Amsterdam report,

"we must preserve the possibility of satisfying life for little men in big societies"; and, from another angle, "to find ways of realizing personal responsibility for collective action in the largest aggregations of power in modern society is a task which has not yet been undertaken seriously". The great Jewish philosopher summarized the task for today in the words, "unmass the masses"; or, in Biblical terms, the Social Gospel movement in Europe and America introduced the vision of the kingdom of God as the dominating element of action. In my conviction, the tide of the time requires that we, not abolishing this vision, supplement it with that of the imitation of Christ, the personal following of our Lord.

This must guide our way also in preaching and church leadership. You can't preach a social gospel before there exists a real relation between God and the listener. You can't be prophetic before you have been priestly. We must remember always, especially nowadays, that the individual is in distress, not in the least through the choking entanglement of modern society.Many church people simply can't grasp what we are talking about—they think that we simply deal with politics. We have to reach the heart before we can guide the brain and the hand.

Christianity is the most social and the most individual religion. Some people at Amsterdam made the right suggestion that those who had joined the third Assembly section, about social relations, should be forced to discuss the problems of the first, the theological section, and the other way round. For we have enough hobby-horse riding! You can't separate the social and individual aspects of Christian faith.

Unmass the masses! For the West, this means to limit the impact of impersonal techniques upon human life. That is clear to all of us who live in industrialized countries. Don't forget, however, that Asiatic and African nations rightly yearn for industries as the only means to check starvation. If anyone wants to solve the paradox by substituting personalistic religion for individualistic, in the line of Buber, Berdyaev, Maritain, Niebuhr, Brunner and others, it is all right to me.

2. *The world can be helped only by a return to the Gospel.*
The world cannot be helped only by a return to the Gospel.

Of course the first holds true. The Amsterdam report also states, "the deepest root of that disorder is the refusal of men to see and admit that their responsibility to God stands over and above their loyalty to any earthly community and their obedience to any worldly power. Our modern society . . . underestimated both the depth of evil in human nature and the full height of freedom and dignity in the children of God". The same note is struck in the Assembly Message. There is no other way out than by Him who

is the way, the truth and the life. Nevertheless, you won't find the words of the first thesis in the Reports. You will find them in many, too many, church papers, sermons, etc. They are true and false. In their deepest sense they are true enough. But in their everyday use they are just cheap and easy—opium for the people. For first of all they keep the conscience quiet. Only a return to the Gospel! That sounds simple—just to go home where the Bible stands on the shelf. It forgets John Robinson's warning "to follow whatsoever light God will yet show forth from the Gospel". What does the Gospel say today? No easy conscience now. The misuse of the Gospel is terrible, not only when the German Christians tried to improve the Bible, but also when present-day Christians misinterpret it, *e.g.*, by confusing, as many do in my country, Christian freedom with capitalistic licence.

And secondly: it depends on what you mean by "helped". Our grandfathers would have used the word "saved". We don't go as far as that now. We don't know how this world will be saved, or even how it can be saved.

But even to help this world requires more than a return to faith. It requires clear thinking, a nearly superhuman grasp of world-wide facts, able craftsmanship, and force to defend elements of justice, freedom and peace. These are not mentioned in the Gospel. They are of Old Testament and Roman descent. And they came within Christian view only after the first Christian emperor Constantine. After a long period of indiscriminate acceptance, they must be revalued by Christianity in the 20th century.

3. *The Church is responsible for justice, peace and liberty on earth.*
   The Church is not responsible for justice, peace and liberty on earth.

To follow the line of the previous argument: is the Church to help the world? It is. Blessed are the merciful. . . . Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness. . . . Blessed are the peacemakers. . . . Nietzsche once besought the Christians, "Brethren, remain faithful to the earth!" On the whole, twentieth-century Christianity has responded to this both heathenistic and Biblical appeal. Has it even gone too far in meeting this appeal?

Here Karl Barth's attack upon the Assembly theme at Amsterdam comes in. What is all this speaking of man's disorder about? It has been disorder ever since the days of Adam and Eve. And there has been salvation ever since the days of Jesus Christ. *We* are not appointed or empowered to save men! No spiritual Marshall plan! We are not assigned to be God's managers, engineers, architects, or advocates. We are only to give witness to His truth. After that emotional morning session at Amsterdam, I happened to meet Dr. Pauck, of Chicago University, who had

to flee Germany in 1933. He was angry. "Up to '33 Barth forbade any Church action to prevent Hitler's coming, saying that the Church can never be bound to any political programme or action. After '33, when it was too late, Karl Barth suddenly stated that 'the command of the hour' required every possible opposition to the Nazi government". And the churches, whose intrusion had been forbidden, had unpreparedly to start the fight[1].

Personally I agree with Dr. Pauck's complaint. But Barth and he were speaking on different levels. And Denis de Rougemont is right in stating that the Christian is to remain attached to the world —but not with all his heart. Before the war a panel-discussion took place at Amsterdam between Liberal, Orthodox and Socialist youth groups. The Liberal Christian speaker agreed that the first demands of man, those of clothing, shelter and food, should first be met. The Orthodox speaker opposed. First, he said, must come the last demands, for the meaning of life and death should be answered. To everybody's amazement, the Socialist said, "You can't separate the two".

This implies that there may be times in which the Church cannot be held responsible for justice, peace and mercy on earth. On the whole, occupation years in Holland formed such a period. Now, it seems, the Church in Eastern Germany is passing through one. But let the Church never forget, though performing its necessary and God-given task for a better society, that it is looking for something greater: for here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come. And only God's grace can give it to us.

4. *Christian morals pay.*
Christian morals do not pay.

Originally it was Henry Ford's discovery that it pays to offer high wages. Today, many employers have discovered that it pays to be friendly to one's employees, to appoint social workers in factory or office. A group of manufacturers in the Hague, not all of them Christians, the other month promised to raise 20,000 guilder for Christian youth work—for they could not get along with the young people they employed—that the threat of communism might be answered by the appeal of the Gospel. Act as a Christian and it pays. Does not the Marshall and Truman plan work along the same lines? There might be some truth in the Communistic statement that America itself gets the benefit of it.

Nevertheless, don't tell this story, that Christian morals pay, to those who live in Eastern Germany; or even to those who in large industries think and act too independently, according to their Christian conscience. How many have had to quit because they could not agree with the means of competition, or because their

[1 See *The Church and the Political Problem of our Day,* by Karl Barth. (Hodder & Stoughton).—Ed.]

Christian belief led them to socialism or pacifism? Don't tell it to our Hungarian or Bulgarian brethren. It is a happy discovery that Christian ethics, and Christian ethics only, open the way to a better, a responsible, social order. But Christianity has to remain very alert, never to identify itself with this coincidence, but to be conscious of the fact that sacrifice is the most natural thing for a Christian, even in the social order.

5. *Our greatest sin is the lack of anxiety.*
   Our greatest sin is the lack of trust.

When I take the first thesis I do not mean that most church people and the churches as a whole are not disturbed by social discrepancies, by oppression and the threat of war. That may be true, but not in the majority of our churches, I think. But what I mean is said in the words of the Amsterdam Message: "Often we have tried to serve God and Mammon, put other loyalties before loyalty to Christ, confused the Gospel with our own economic or national or racial interests".

The range of possible self-deception is immense. We denounce Communism without ever talking with a communist. In these, and uncountable other respects, we act like those middle-class people who form the rank and file of every church in the world.

Lack of anxiety or lack of trust—which is the greater sin? But here the latter is the origin of the former. A real trust in God's holy grace for unholy people would make us stick less to our group convictions and social blinkers. My greatest trouble with Karl Barth is not that he puts the greatest emphasis upon trust and confidence, but that he never tells us what a life of trust might be, what the ethical implications of confidence might be. The Church needs more humility, more discipleship and more evangelic firmness in the midst of the social disorder. In Holland Dr. Kraemer once wrote: "The clearest sign of the bourgeois character of the Christian Church is that everyone—the elders included—accept their economic position and advantage as of self-evident primary importance, confining the sacrifice of one's possessions and positions only to some extreme people".

I resist quoting again the Amsterdam message. But our greatest sin remains lack of trust, of sacrifice, of obedience to Christ, of evangelistic joy.

6. *The advance of the twentieth-century social theology was the discovery of the tragic.*
   The misery of the twentieth-century social theology was the discovery of the tragic.

I think no one has contributed more to this discovery than Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, whose books, I suppose, are more or less known to you. His clarification of the rôle of tragedy in history has given a new sense to St. Paul's complaint: "the good I would, I do not,

but the evil which I would not, I do''. Niebuhr has a typical joy in the *démasque* of the good intent: too often it is self-deceiving; too often it is frustrated by reality. Take good old pacifism: didn't it tend to hand humanity helplessly over to Hitler? Take the awakening of the individual conscience; didn't it open the road to individualism, atomism, secularism, nihilism?

Even the Amsterdam report has a notion of the tragic. ''Men are often disillusioned by finding that changes of particular systems do not bring unqualified good, but fresh evils. New temptations to greed and power arise, even in systems more just than those they have replaced, because sin is ever present in the human heart''.

This discovery was a great help. It opened the eyes to the constant intermingling of good and evil. It diminished the chances of self-deception. But it overstated its case. Or rather, it did not take into account that tragedy is a Greek, not a Biblical conception. There is a gap between sin and tragedy, the gap of the Holy. The idea of the tragic chokes the prophetic spirit. Who can define God's possibilities? Would the nineteenth-century Southerner not have said that slavery was tragically inevitable? And where God's holy will is at stake, who is allowed to predict frustration? The Gospel does not bother about Peter having to put his sword away so ''tragically'', leaving Jesus to his armed murderers. Do the examples of pacifism and individual conscience just quoted imply that from a Christian viewpoint pacifism and individual conscience are wrong? Are we to be judged by results and successes?

Niebuhr is denouncing pacifism too easily. It might be that Christian pacifism or some Christian social action takes all possibilities of tragic failure into real account and still has to go its own way. The Church does not have to govern—it has to proclaim life under Christ's guidance and to denounce everything that pretends, under whatever presumption, to know better than Christ. Personally I am convinced that Judas was the man who wanted to serve Christ by presuming to know better than Christ himself how He should be served. So it is in Roman Catholic power politics. Our Protestant churches in their struggle with Communism too often fall into the same pit. Again, we have to trust God's revelation of life in Jesus Christ overcoming even the power of the tragic.

7. *The Church stands in full solidarity with mankind.*
   The Church does not stand in full solidarity with mankind.

Ever and again the deceit of Christianity has been to shy away from the bad world and build its own tower of isolation. In Holland we get Christian political parties, a Christian radio organization, Christian trade unions, Christian football clubs, *etc.* In essence,

this is the sectarian approach—to remain free from the pollution of the world. It sounds, and is, pharisaical.

On the other hand, it is moving to hear Niemöller speak of his share in Germany's guilt, and to read the repeated confession of guilt of the churches in the Amsterdam report. The murdering of the Jews, the devastation of Germany, the Communist uprising in Middle and Eastern Europe, in Asia and Africa are also our guilt.

But how can the Church accept this solidarity and nevertheless offer something better to the world?

The solution can only come by radically accepting the solidarity of the guilt, not that of the crime; solidarity with the sinners, not with the sin. The churches have been shown the way of life. It is right that only in ultimate cases should they deny their solidarity with their government, with the employers or employees among their members. But it is high time that the churches developed their own strategy, their own community life between classes and races. But we must not play with the idea of the Church returning to the catacombs again. The German churches once did it—did it too soon. But we are not allowed either to leave this item out of the account. There is a limit to the solidarity between the world and the Church, between the State and the Church, between the church member and his clan. A lonely way starts there. A path for pioneers. I'm thinking of those French Roman Catholic priests who gave up all their privileges and are working among the Marseilles dock-workers, carrying heavy sacks of concrete all day and in the evening with sore hands and heads, celebrating Mass on the attic floor of some poor house for the few who might attend. I'm thinking of Bishop Oxnam's appeal. I'm thinking also of those employers who are trying out new ways of co-operation in their factories. Other instances might be added. For a Christian there is no limit of solidarity with his suffering, guilty, fellow-men.

8. *The Church should devote all its energy to society.*
The Church should devote all its energy to itself.

We would not discuss our topic at all if we did not agree with the first statement. At the same time, we would not discuss our topic in this Council if we expected these theses only to clash. But on this occasion I should like to stress the second thesis, adding that the best contribution the Church could and should make to society is itself, that is to say, a real church, a community of believers, a congregation of the Lord, open to the world but preserving its own life; in the words of the Amsterdam report, "the greatest contribution that the Church can make to the renewal of society is for it to be renewed in its own life in faith and obedience to its Lord. Such inner renewal includes a clearer grasp of the meaning of the Gospel for the whole life of man. This renewal must take place both in the larger units of the Church and in the local congregations.

THE RESPONSIBLE SOCIETY

By John C. Bennett, D.D.

The report of the section of the Amsterdam Assembly that dealt with the Church and the Social Disorder has in its central position provided a sound platform for the World Council of Churches as it seeks to be a *World* Council in a divided world. It is evidence of its soundness that it has been attacked both by the uncritical supporters of free enterprise and by the propaganda authorities on the communist side of the Iron Curtain, by the Monthly Letter of the National City Bank and by the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate. The report enables the World Council to stand strongly against the religious errors and the totalitarian methods of Communism and at the same time to avoid complete identification with the social or the economic institutions which are associated with either communism or capitalism. This address is not intended to be another report about Amsterdam, but a discussion of the major issues which this International Congregational Council must confront today in the light of the findings of Amsterdam.

I shall speak of three issues: (1) the attitude which we should take toward communism; (2) the way in which we should deal with the contrast between contemporary forms of democratic socialism and capitalism; (3) the meaning for us of the goal of "The Responsible Society" emphasized in the Amsterdam report.

I. Communism

The most fateful problem that we face is set for us by the advance of Communist power since the end of the second World War. Communism as a world movement, with its base in the Soviet Union, has great strength in eastern Europe and now it threatens to become the dominant power in Asia. The Amsterdam report made clear that there are deep conflicts between Christianity and Communism. Communism is theoretically atheistic and practically idolatrous. It offers a false promise of social redemption. Its methods are ruthless and tyrannical. In spite of the optimism in communist teaching about the new growth of freedom expected as a by-product of successful revolution, if the communist power does come to control a nation, there will be extreme difficulty in establishing or re-establishing the conditions for political and spiritual freedom. Already it is evident that, while communist authorities may not seek to destroy the Church, they will—as much as it suits their purpose—curtail the activities of the Church and try to use the Church as an instrument for communist propaganda.

So much we can say as Christians about the necessity of resisting

the extension of Communism. It would be natural for any group that is as closely associated with the institutions of the West as is this Council to feel the full force of this kind of argument against Communism. But, immediately, we come upon an embarrassing fact known to all who were at Amsterdam. It is the fact that there are Christians in Asia and in eastern Europe who, with full honesty, make the judgment that, in their situations, Communism as a movement is actually the lesser evil and that to resist it is to play into the hands of reactionary forces which, even more than Communism, are in conflict with Christianity. I am not referring to those who may for the sake of expediency become uncritical collaborators with Communist governments. I refer rather to those represented by Dr. Joseph Hromadaka in eastern Europe and Dr. T. C. Chao in China, who retain their Christian standpoint and who criticize Communist ideology, but who, in effect, give moral support to Communism in their countries, because they believe that it is sounder socially and economically than any available alternative. I believe that we should try to understand their point of view and that we should respect them fully. Also, I believe that, at the end of the day, the position which they have taken in their countries may be justified if it prevents the Churches from showing a reactionary face and preserves contact between the Churches and the people, including the people who are attracted by Communism. But two reservations are necessary. One is that they probably under-estimate the extent to which the constructive elements in Communism have been perverted by its profound religious error and by its totalitarianism. They may be victims of an illusion concerning the more moderate character of the particular form of Communism that will prevail in their countries; if so, they do spread a certain amount of moral confusion in the Church at large, even though, within the limited possibilities open to them, they may have chosen the best course. The other reservation is for us more important. What these men believe about the Christian attitude toward Communism should not be transferred unaltered to any situation where a constructive alternative to Communism exists. Their example should not be allowed to discourage resistance to Communism where such resistance does not lead to a reactionary defence of the *status quo*.

I shall now summarize what I believe our attitude toward Communism should be after we have taken account of the problem which I have just mentioned.

(1) We should resist Communism politically wherever there is a constructive alternative and we should resist its religious error and its totalitarianism by spiritual means everywhere.

(2) We should not allow ourselves to become instruments of those who would wage a "holy war" against Communism. Here

Protestants should make it clear that they are not allies of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in its anti-communist crusade. We should recognize that Communism is a judgment upon Churches, upon the whole middle class world to which we belong.

(3) We should never lose contact with the people who are attracted by Communism because it promises to deliver them from poverty and racial discrimination. The Church must not allow the people of any nation to be ostracized. It is not strange that people, who have never shared the advantages of white, middle class Christians in the West, find the promises of Communists concerning what they will do more impressive than the explanations of Christians concerning what they have not done.

(4) We should always insist that the centre of any effective resistance to Communism must be a constructive programme that will do more effectively what the Communists promise to do. Though there is a necessary military factor in the effort of Western nations to prevent the extension of the power of Communism in the world, this military factor must always be kept subordinate to the attempt to increase the areas of economic and social health in the world. (Discussion of the military factor must be left to another address.)

(5) We should recognize that, on the deepest level, the problem of Communism is a problem of faith and that it sets for the Church an evangelistic task of overwhelming urgency. I do not mean that we should think of evangelism as one of several ways of defending our civilization against Communism. The purpose of Christian evangelism in this, as in all, situations is to help human souls find the truth of the Gospel and to become related to the community of faith because of *their* needs and not because of *our* need of defence against their errors. There are innumerable persons who find in Communism a faith which makes more sense than any other faith which they have understood and, what is more, a faith that is joined with appropriate action. Such a faith will never be overcome by sneers or threats or military force, but only by a sounder faith, which is also joined with appropriate action.

II. Capitalism and Socialism

The Amsterdam report did over-simplify the situation in suggesting in one passage that the real conflict in the world today is between Capitalism and Communism. We must make allowance for facts of which Amsterdam took no account. One is the fact that the hostility between Communists and Socialists is often more acute than that between Communists and Conservatives. This is true in part because they are closer competitors, but it is true also because most Socialists love freedom and know what happens to it under Communism. Also, Amsterdam passed over the fact that there is still a great deal of tension between the defenders of free enterprise,

especially in America, and those who represent even the milder forms of democratic socialism. There is a certain type of American Conservative who is more afraid of British Socialism than of Russian Communism.

Against the background of these facts, we can perhaps more accurately describe our situation. There is, as I have said, a deep conflict between Communism, not as an economic system but as an ideology and as a form of political totalitarianism, and the Christian Church. But the conflicts between economic systems belong to another level. Here Christians can make particular criticisms and offer particular warnings, but there is no economic system which must be supported or rejected by Christians.

Amsterdam did not condemn either Communism or Capitalism as economic systems. The most controversial sentence that came out of Amsterdam was the sentence rejecting the "ideologies of both Communism and *laissez faire* Capitalism". This was widely misinterpreted because the word "ideology" was either misunderstood or ignored. The only aspect of capitalism rejected in that sentence is the false promise often made in the name of capitalism that "justice will follow as a by-product of free enterprise". In another paragraph, capitalism is criticized for several tendencies which are present in varying degrees, but capitalism as a system is not condemned. Indeed the Report says that the "development of capitalism as a system is not condemned". It goes on to say that "developments of capitalism vary from country to country and often the exploitation of the workers that was characteristic of early capitalism has been corrected by trade unions, social legislation and responsible management".

It has often been said that since the Report never mentioned Socialism, it implies that Socialism is the one Christian form of economic organization. Since the British delegates were known to be more vocal than any other group, there has been a suspicion, in some circles, that the report was really designed to support British Socialism. But this would be a surprise to British Conservatives who gave it strong support. The argument between defenders of Socialism and defenders of Capitalism did not often come to the surface at Amsterdam because of the attention given to the deeper spiritual and political conflict between East and West.

In this Council meeting, this argument is likely to arouse greater interest. What should be said about it in the light of the Amsterdam findings?

Amsterdam pointed toward a new way, often called "a third way". As an economic system, completely consistent, Socialism cannot be distinguished from Communism. This third way is based upon the assumption that no known economic system adequately serves all the values which an economic system should serve—pro-

ductivity, justice and freedom. Doctrinaire conceptions of both Capitalism and Socialism fail to take account of the permanent human problems which will exist in all situations. For one thing, both of them offer much too simple solutions for the problem of incentive. Every industrial nation has been forced to deal with the unsolved problems of capitalism through social legislation and through the acceptance by government of responsibility to prevent the recurrence of mass unemployment. It is not difficult to see that there is no Socialistic panacea, that there are problems for which Socialism has no solution. The assumption that if the injustice and the anarchy of capitalism can be overcome, freedom will take care of itself is plainly false. What is needed today is deliverance from the tendency to substitute ideologies, slogans, and labels for realities. The Church must be a critic of the *status quo* in all situations. In an individualistic economy its emphasis must be on justice and security. In a somewhat collectivistic economy its emphasis must be on social pluralism and freedom.

If we relate these considerations to what is actually happening in Great Britain and the United States, we can see that both countries, in somewat different ways, are embarked on experiments along this third way. In neither country is there now much confidence in doctrinaire Capitalism or doctrinaire Socialism. But I shall speak here only of the United States. There is a real split in the American consciousness between the ideology and slogans of the individualistic Capitalism, which most Americans praise, and the revolution which has radically changed the rôle of government in regard to all matters of social welfare and through which the Labour movement has achieved a quite new legal status and great economic and political power. A large part of the business community still hopes to reverse this trend, but this is impossible both morally and politically. I believe that the American Churches should take a constructive attitude toward these changes, that they should counteract the conservative assumptions, still so strong among Protestants and not least among Congregationalists, according to which these changes are rejected in principle, and that they should prepare the minds of Christians for new standards of criticism that transcend the old right-left controversies. It is important that criticisms of the new be so directed that they will not serve a reactionary purpose. I leave to those who come from Britain any comments on the responsibility of the British Churches. My impression is that these suggestions with some differences in emphasis are relevant also to their situation.

III. The Responsible Society

The Amsterdam Report tried to state what the essential Christian objectives are in the struggle for human freedom. It avoided the

use of the word, "Democracy", because of its chequered history especially on the European continent, where its association with the French Revolution has often led to serious distortions. At one time the words, "free society", were suggested as the key words to indicate what was intended. But these seemed too one-sided, for they did not place freedom in its right relation to other values which are equally necessary. The words finally chosen were "the responsible society". This always has two sides to it—the responsibility of free men for community and the responsibility of government to the governed. This dual meaning of the "responsible society" is well summarized in the words of the Report that describe such a society as one "where freedom is the freedom of men who acknowledge responsibility to justice and public order, and where those who hold political authority or economic power are responsible for its exercise to God and the people whose welfare is affected by it."

This Congregational Council represents a tradition which has had an enormous part in the development of modern democracy in its Western sense. This idea of "the responsible society" is itself dependent for its full development on this democratic experience. If this is regarded as the core of democracy, then we can say that Christianity has a close affinity with democracy. One of the remarkable changes in Christian thought in the past half century is the recognition of this affinity by large sections of the Church, even by Pope Pius XII in his famous Christmas address in 1944. In contrast to all forms of totalitarianism, Christians must give support to democracy. In contrast to the idea of "Godly oligarchies" which have often tempted Christians, including Congregationalists, in the past, we must prefer democracy.

Democracy, as a form of society, must be distinguished from democratic philosophies, which have been based upon the ideas of human perfectibility, or which know no law above the momentary will of the people. Majority rule must be checked by the freedom of minorities to criticize those in power and to organize to replace them. Otherwise majority rule is likely to be the first step toward tyranny. Freedom for minorities, for the conscience of the lonely person, all the forms of cultural and religious freedom are today more important for emphasis than the idea of popular government. These two aspects of democracy, majority rule and freedom for minorities, need to be kept together, for neither in the long run is safe without the other.

Those who stand for democracy in this sense should not allow themselves to be put on the defensive by the kind of propaganda that pictures all the institutions of democracy as a front for an oppressive Capitalism, or as providing only what is called "formal freedom" for the many but substantial freedom for the privileged few. It is true that economic opportunity does determine in large

part the substance of freedom and that there is a racial group in the United States which is often denied the substance of freedom. But where democracy exists, there is always the chance to criticize every injustice and to organize to correct it. There is openness in such a society; there is the continuous opportunity for reform. Christians have responsibility to establish this type of society where it is possible to do so and to preserve it and improve it where it exists.

Democracy as I have described it, does exist, even though it is very imperfect. Its very existence is threatened in three ways.

It is threatened by the extension of Communist power from one country to another. Most often this power has moved into nations which are more feudal than democratic, but in the case of Czecho-Slovakia we have one example of a democracy overwhelmed by Communist pressure from without and from within.

It is threatened by hysteria concerning communism. It would be possible for a nation to lose its freedom gradually in its effort to prevent communistic minorities from infiltrating into its institutions. This is a remote and yet real danger in the United States. There are always powerful groups which are glad to use the Communist scare to discourage all criticism of the *status quo*.

It is threatened most of all by the loss of the religious and moral substance of the life of the community. Democracy is no panacea. Its health depends upon the spiritual health of the people, though this point must not be used by those who claim to possess the key to spiritual health as an excuse for them to rule over their neighbours who are supposed to lack it. The words of Amsterdam which define the responsibility of those who hold political authority or economic power as responsibility "to God and the people" are essential words. Unless a community has some sense of the rule of God, it is likely to do one of two things, to make an idol out of its own community life or to lose all responsibility for the public good. In the former case, the end may be fanatical and cruel totalitarianism; in the latter, the end may be social conflicts and disorder which lead to totalitarian rule as a supposed remedy.

The responsible society as defined at Amsterdam is indeed the goal for Christian efforts in society. It is a moving goal that in each new generation gains new content. In our generation the new content, which needs greatest emphasis, is the recognition that freedom lacks substance if it is sought apart from economic justice, and that the quest for economic justice may lead to new forms of oppression which destroy it, unless this quest is united with an insistent concern for freedom. Here all that I have said is tied together. This Council can help the Churches which it represents to see more clearly the steps that must be taken in each national situation to establish, improve, or defend the institutions of the responsible society.

THE CHURCH IN THE INTERNATIONAL DISORDER

By Elfan Rees, M.A.

In preparing this paper, I have found myself moving from some great contemporary problems, with which I am not wholly unfamiliar, to some great eternal questions in whose study I am so unversed that I have but dimly and faintly perceived the answers. I have been troubled from the first by the wording of the central theme of the Amsterdam Assembly, lest too sharp a contrast be drawn. "Man's Disorder and God's Design" seems to propound a dichotomy which may not exist and to suggest an antithesis which, at least in part, may be false. Arnold Toynbee has said "In the vision seen by the Prophets, history is not a cyclic and not a mechanical process. It is the masterful and progressive execution of a divine plan. . . . While civilizations rise and fall . . . some purposeful enterprise higher than theirs may all the time be making headway, and, in a divine plan the learning that comes through the suffering caused by the failure of civilizations may be the sovereign means of progress."

"Abraham was an emigré from a civilization *in extremis,* the Prophets were children of another civilization in disintegration, Christianity was born of the sufferings of a disintegrating Graeco-Roman world. Will some comparable spiritual enlightenment be kindled in the 'Displaced Persons' who are the counterparts in our world of those exiles to whom so much was revealed in their painful exile by the waters of Babylon?"

Martin Wight propounds the same thesis when he says: "We do not find in the Bible anything resembling the secular theory of progress. What we find there is a scheme of purification through catastrophe and redemption through suffering, the rediscovery in our individual lives and our corporate histories of resurrection after passion and death".

Even more succinctly, in the introduction to the Amsterdam volumes, President van Dusen wrote: "God's design for the ordering of human society is an act both of judgment and redemption".

This view of history and of God's design is to me incontrovertible. I would prefer, therefore, to speak of the Church *in* the International Disorder, affirm that the disorder is part of the design and seek in it both the judgment and the redemption. At this point, I am at once faced with the dilemma of one who believes in "the

forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting" and who yet prays "Thy Kingdom come, Thy Will be done on earth".

I seem to accept at one and the same time, Christ's revelation of ultimate bliss in the transcendent order beyond space and time and the Jewish apocalyptic view of an age of bliss within history after some final catastrophe. Or, if you like, the dictum of the Epistle to the Hebrews that "here have we no abiding city" *and* Aristotle's conception of the State as the framework for the good life.

We cannot, I think, proceed any further with a Christian assessment of the international situation without first having a synthesis between these apparent contradictions. We must seek to know whether we who believe in the triumph of God in Eternity can also work and pray for the triumph of God in History. In matters of faith the achievement of a synthesis need not involve the production of a logical formula. It is more a question of deciding the degree to which we can take both beliefs seriously and see them as parts of a single purpose.

I am woefully ill-equipped for this task. My qualifications to speak to you at all are neither of wisdom nor learning, but arise simply out of my experience during the past ten years as I have worked among people in exile and that for two of those years I lived in Soviet-occupied or Soviet-dominated territory. I would speak only of that which I know, and my themes therefore are those of Refugees and of the persecuted Church; my sources are the Exilic Prophets and early Christian history. There is bound to be more of Europe than of the world in my outlook and more of Disorder than of Design in my experience.

Let me first affirm as an article of my faith that the ultimate purpose of God can only be fulfilled in eternity. There will always be sin in history and in mortal man, and where there is sin His Kingdom is not perfect. It does not seem to follow, however, that this belief need preclude a belief in the triumph of God in history—the fulfilment of His design in time—if we can truly apprehend the nature and purpose of that triumph, of that design. We can recognize that we do not live in a Christian world, and must ponder whether we who are Christians are called to Christianize the world or to be Christians in it; whether God's purpose is met when we have made disciples *in* all the nations or *of* all the nations.

I cannot escape the conclusion that our calling is to be God's witnesses in a naughty world and that the Church of Christ will always be a minority movement. Far from relieving us of responsibility and concern for events in time, this fact imposes upon us the duties of a minority—the duties of witness and representation,

of protest and amendment. Max Warren has written: "We Christians are citizens of two worlds. The tension of this dual citizenship is that we must live in the one world by the directives of the other. Because both worlds belong to God, it is possible, though costly. Its possibility has been demonstrated by Jesus Christ—its costliness by the Cross". Elsewhere the same writer says: "In the events of history, God acts. This continuing activity is the ground of Christian hope. It is also the summons to the Christian to co-operate with God in history".

Let us look at two outstanding events in contemporary history —as guides. First the unprecedented misery of people and second the dangerous contention of Powers.

At the end of the war there were nine million displaced persons in Europe. These, the survivors of the Nazi systems of forced labour and concentration camp, seemed, at that time, to constitute a major European tragedy. There is a sense in retrospect in which that was not wholly so. They *had* survived and they were going home. In those days, as one concentration camp after another was being liberated, you met these people on every road in Europe, hitch-hiking home with hope in their hearts. Exile seems bearable in terms of return. The process of repatriation, and latterly of resettlement, has gone on with the years, and it is only as the problem has been reduced in size that its elemental tragedy is revealed. There are only some 800,000 left now in the care of the International Refugee Organization—Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Poles, Czechs. There is no hope for them except new lives in new homes. Belated but generous action by the United States and by Australia has made life real again for many of this remnant—we confidently expect to see them resettled within the next two years. At that time there will remain the ultimate tragedy—the sick and their dependents, the aged, the uneconomic family, the personally unacceptable, *les pauvres* as they have been well described; for whom there seem no prospects of resettlement.

I.R.O. will cease to exist at that time—and there will be left, at the mercy, as far as I can see, of Christian charity, as many as 200,000 of these war victims with nowhere to lay their heads. There will be no Jews among them and very few Catholics.

Were that the sum of this tragedy, it perhaps would merit no more attention than it gets. But the half is not told. While the humanitarian agencies of the United Nations were at work resolving this problem, their political brethren, at Potsdam and elsewhere, were creating in careless and ill-aimed revenge the largest refugee problem in European history. The refugees were stripped of their possessions, driven from their homes and deported with indescribable ferocity from Czechoslovakia, East Prussia, Silesia, the

Danube basin—there are ten million people homeless and helpless in Germany today. They constitute one-tenth of the population of Austria. They are excluded by definition and on grounds of racial discrimination from United Nations care. Nor is the end yet—fugitives from the police States of eastern Europe are arriving daily in the West to swell the totals by alarmingly large numbers. Finally let us not forget that in the Middle East there are more than half a million refugees from Palestine who regard the Christian Church as having let them down to the degree that we have escaped the sin of anti-semitism.

In the pauperization, unemployment and waste of these people lies Europe's major bar to economic recovery. In their *irridentism,* their disinheritance and their cynicism lie the very stuff that produces Hitlers, the seeds of easy war. In their existence as a submerged fifth class lies the possibility of another proletariat.

In one remarkable thing about them lies a very special challenge to the Church. One of the most moving facts about these exiles is that almost the only thing they have brought with them is their faith or a desire for it. The machinery of their legal and political life has disappeared; they are Stateless persons without passports or rights of movement; their Church buildings and schools and lands and their whole ecclesiastical machinery have been swept away—their faith in the ultimate mercy of God abides with them, so far. In an almost primitive tribal way, their tenuous lives revolve around their Church and their pastor, upon whom leadership has devolved. They are known and categorized far oftener by their faith and confession than by their race and nationality. The deluge will come if their faith fails them. Their dear desire is that of all exiles—to return home. Their expectancy of its realization lies in their hope of a third world war, the defeat of Leviathan and their entry into their kingdom.

And so let us turn and see who is Leviathan. We must surely begin by recognizing that nowhere today do we live in a Christian world.

Our current preoccupation with the militancy of Communism and our sharp dissociation from its philosophy is apt to lead us into the error of identifying ourselves with some more familiar and more acceptable order of society and calling it Christian. The truth is that the Church is a minority movement wherever in the world it is to be found. We shall fail in our calling unless we are as sensitive to being tolerated but ignored in the West as we now are sensitive to being persecuted but taken seriously in the East.

The picture I see of the international disorder is one of what has been called a "bi-dimensional" world, for dominion over which two Leviathans contend. They spring from the same matrix; they

are both begotten by power out of materialism—the one at best sees justice and freedom as the ends of life, the other order and community. Both of them are anti-Christ, if only because the idols they have set up promise no more than that they will triumph in history.

To the Christian wherever he is set, such a world is Enemy Occupied Territory. We are called always to be a resistance movement and we dare not be unprepared to become an underground movement. I was deeply moved to hear Visser 't Hooft say recently: "The old Christians were called by their adversaries a *tertium genus*—a third race. For they broke through the accepted categories of the classical world and produced new forces which shaped a completely different world. In their time they seemed an ineffective "third force" which would not let itself be pigeonholed by the current ideologies. It would seem that our generation of Christians has reason to remember that example. For thus we see that this particular third force is not a weak compromise and not a middle position between two opposing standpoints. . . . In other words, the Christian force, when it operates as it should, is the force of tomorrow. It is the attitude which does not seek to return to the past or adapt itself to the present but to point to the new day".

The Church must become certain again that neither path of life commended to us today can lead to salvation, for salvation is in Christ. Only in Him can there be true freedom and genuine community, a freedom that is without indiscipline and a community that is without tyranny, because freedom recognizes the will of God and community bows to the rights of brother men. A recent manifesto of the "Working Association of Christian Churches in Germany" has done well to point the Christian way through this dilemma: "Only through the Gospel of Jesus Christ" it reads, "is the final answer given to the question of the true relation between freedom and responsibility, between the rights of the individual and the demands of the community; only in the Kingdom of God its real fulfilment. In this period of the world's history we have to do battle in order that some day a truly good middle path be found and kept to between indiscipline and tyranny, but we have no call to fight for the idol of freedom against the idol of fellowship, or the other way round, as if our salvation and that of mankind depended upon it. For thus speaks the Lord to His people, 'Thou runnest upon calamity, for with Me alone is salvation'."

* * *

If we of the Church are but a minority—a "peculiar people"—if we look for the triumph of God in eternity and yet must work

for the fulfilment of His purpose in time—then the Church's vocation is

To Be; To Bear Witness; and To Prepare the Way.

To Be

Resistance movements have often been the breath of God in history. Who knows better than we Congregationalists the inspiration that produced, within the Church, Nonconformity and Dissent. But how slowly we learn that history outpaces us. In these times, and in this disorder, the essence of being for the Church is union. We shall be false to our faith and weaken ourselves for our calling if we persist in disunion. And the sands are running out. We are already in danger of being forced into a defensive union "to save something from the wreck", because we are so tardy in achieving a positive creative union that we may more perfectly become God's instrument in this time. I should be false to my conscience if I did not assert here my conviction that union like charity begins at home. I just express an uneasy fear—which I hope you can resolve—lest international federations of one Confession may become tragic and facile alternatives to the much more difficult task, first, of national, and finally, of world union of all confessions. At the same time the Church has learned that, wherever she is truly a Church, there is unity. It is equally urgent that we should take care lest we lose the substance of spiritual unity in striving for the shadow of organic union. Our first ecumenical task is to see the brother in the neighbour Church.

To Bear Witness

There is no escape from the fact that we bear witness by suffering.

Reinhold Niebuhr, writing on this very subject in preparation for Amsterdam, said: "In this situation the first task of the Christian Churches is to interpret our sorrows and distresses, the agonies and pains through which the world is passing and to recognize the hand of God in them. . . . The prophets of Israel saw no possibility that the entire nation would thus interpret the vicissitudes of history. They hoped that the renewal of life would be possible through a "saving remnant" which would understand them from the standpoint of faith".

In the Displaced Persons Camps and Refugee Communities of western Europe, as in the prisons and the modest homes of eastern Europe, that "saving remnant" persists and understands. The nerve centre of all that is good and hopeful in the refugee camps is the Church in their midst. No greater witness is being given today than by the priests and pastors in exile—their integrity and that of their congregations is unbroken. Their acknowledgment of judgment, their will to be, and to resist evil, and their

conviction of the ultimate mercy of God are truly exilic. Nowhere in our times is there a clearer vindication than in what has befallen them and what they are of the moral element in history in an age of cataclysm. Do we understand? and can we persist?

It is not our duty to go to the catacombs, but it is our duty to be ready to go underground if we are forced. I do not want to make confessional comparisons, but no Church is better able to do this than ours, if only we can rediscover our expectancy and our fellowship in suffering. If only we can recreate in what we habitually call "the Fellowship of the Lord's Supper" the Passover sense of imminent journey—so that once again the chosen people are found "with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet and your staff in your hand". Our Churches were born of resistance. They forfeit the right to be in these times, unless they recognize that they also are born for resistance.

And so finally we are called

To be Prepared and to Prepare the Way

Just as the Incarnation was impossible until Israel was prepared, so the Parousia is impossible until this "remnant", the Church, is prepared. And this is no eclectic, monastic self-preparation. We cannot run away. We cannot abandon responsibility for the things of this world for some preoccupation with the end of history. We must consider the soul and its environment. As Alexander Miller writes "To be indifferent to the way in which social life is ordered is in fact to take sides—to take sides with corruption and tyranny since social evils feed on the indifference and inactivity of ordinary folk". We must prepare the way by our testimony to the good and our denunciation of evil. The essence of the task is that witness is impossible in general terms. We have to be specific. We have to testify at this point and that point, to this truth and against that evil. To each of us his task—you can define your own far better than I. In my own experience, the sin of our time is the disinheritance of man. I am encouraged to find United Nations at least defining the rights of man, but it is part of our sickness that we define as Human Rights what are in fact Divine Rights.

"The Church *in* International Disorder"—that has always been the setting of the Church—in such conditions it has its being and its duty. We are called upon to unite, because without unity we cannot be in these days. We are called upon to suffer, because without suffering there can be no repentance and no vision. We are called upon to prepare the way.

CHRISTIANITY IN THE ATOMIC AGE

By Sir Alfred Zimmern

We are standing, in these years, at a major turning-point in human history. Every educated man and woman is, or should be, conscious of this and of the fresh thinking and readjustment of old modes and prepossessions for which it calls in their individual approach to national and world affairs. Particularly does this call apply to individual Christians, to the active members of the Christian Churches who form the stuff and substance of Christian public opinion.

What are the main elements in the new world situation which we are thus called upon to face?

Three great events have taken place, each of them bringing with it a train of momentous consequences. The first is the discovery of atomic energy. The second is the end of the system of balance of power which prevailed in international relations in the West from round about 1500 till the close of World War II. The third is the sudden eclipse of colonialism in Asia, foreshadowing its approaching end in Africa also.

Let us consider each of these in order, trying to assess their significance for us as Christians.

The discovery of atomic energy is epoch-making in the fullest sense of that somewhat overworked term. The physical scientists tell us that it is a landmark in human history comparable to the discovery of fire. We are too close to the event to be able to measure it in its true proportions. We can only dimly surmise the effects which the peaceful use of atomic energy, which we are informed will take some forty years to develop (what are forty years in the perspective of history?), will exert upon the industrial and social life of mankind: but one thing already stands out unmistakably. The appearance on the scene of world affairs of this great new source of power, with its appalling potentialities as a military weapon, has made it imperative to ensure that uncontrolled power should no longer be left in the hands of individual governments. Here is a force which, in the interests of the human race as a whole, must be brought under the control and guardianship of one law, of world law.

The statesmen of three of the countries represented in this Conference, the United States, Great Britain and Canada, the countries most closely associated with the discovery, were quick to draw this lesson. Only three months after its announcement, they joined together in committing their countries to the placing of atomic energy

under the control of the United Nations. This policy has since been elaborated in the Baruch Report, which has now been accepted by the great majority of the members of the United Nations. The opposition of the Kremlin, which clings obstinately to a pre-atomic and non-co-operative concept of sovereignty, alone blocks the road to the setting up of the proposed World Authority. Four years at the most separate us from the hour in which the rulers of Russia may have this engine of destruction at their disposal—to be used as and when may suit their self-centred purpose, with as little warning as the many other sudden twists and turns which have characterized their policy during the last 30 years.

Have we, as students of world affairs and as Christians, thought seriously enough over this grim prospect? Do we fully grasp what it would mean to be living as next-door neighbours of a government which would have brought about, not a condition of total war, but something more intolerable even than that, a condition of total instability, a state of affairs when no long-distance effort will seem worth while because no man can say what institution, what city, what region will be leading a normal existence on the morrow? Do we realize the extent to which this approaching situation is already projecting its shadow over the world, both over our political and social life and over our whole outlook? Already we are becoming accustomed, almost as a matter of routine development, to plans for the dispersion of industries and the transplantation of cities, plans based upon the acceptance of a war economy in its most up-to-date form as a condition of indefinite duration. But what is more ominous, and should give us especial pause as Christians, is the toll that this instability is exacting, in terms of anxiety and mental stress, from men in responsible positions, placed where they can watch the danger as it draws ever nearer. Two such public servants in this country, both of them men noted for their deep devotion to duty, have recently become victims of this anxiety in dramatic circumstances. How many men there must be, here and elsewhere, who are bearing a similar load and perhaps resisting a similar temptation! Truly we are already living in the valley of the shadow of death.

Is there anything that we as Christians can do in the face of this dark prospect? Is there any way in which the Christian Churches and individual Christians can help to dispel it?

I think there are two ways in which we can help and in which it is our duty to help.

The first is to have the courage to face the problem of atomic energy, to face it steadily, constantly, thoroughly, in all its bearings and implications. I have a strong impression that what is weighing most on the minds of those who are in close contact with this problem, both the statesmen and the atomic scientists, is not the

problem itself, complex and difficult though it is, but the unwillingness of the Western peoples to keep it before their minds and to face its practical implications. In 1945, when the shock first burst upon us, we were full of fine resolutions—New Year resolutions for the new epoch! But they have gradually faded away, and what has taken their place is a mood of stolid impassivity, what the theologians would call 'invincible' apathy. This is not a Christian state of mind. May I go further and suggest that it is markedly unchristian? Is it not much closer to the kismet of the Moslems and to the Buddhists' wheel of destiny than to the faithful vigilance, the alertness of mind and spirit, enjoined on us in the parable of the Ten Virgins?

What purpose can such vigilance serve in connection with the problem of atomic energy? Is there anything definite for which we ought to prepare our minds? This brings me to my second point—the need to be ready to take united action as Christians.

We are entering here into the region of political speculation: but I think it is reasonable to suppose that the present state of tension will not be allowed to continue until we drift across the deadline of 1953, and before that hour arrives a further attempt will be made to bring about the world control of atomic energy on lines calculated to allay the suspicions and safeguard the self-respect of the Soviet Union, in so far as the purposes of its rulers are, as they so repeatedly affirm, purely defensive in character. A sharp crisis may then ensue, and it is for this that Christian leadership should be preparing itself beforehand. The statesmen engaged in this difficult and delicate venture, upon which the whole future of our civilization may depend, should be enabled to feel that they have behind them a united Christian community, eager both to strengthen their hands and to help them to maintain the purity and integrity of their purposes, as trustees for mankind as a whole.

If and when this crisis has been surmounted, we shall find ourselves in a new world—a world of assured peace and international co-operation, a world often foreshadowed in perorations but hitherto largely unexplored. It is for us as Christians to take an active part in this task of exploration. What will be the nature of the political system under which mankind will then be living—living, perhaps, already within the coming decade?

This brings me to the second great change in the world-situation, the sudden eclipse of the European diplomatic system, with its tradition of balance and rivalry between a number of independent and self-centred Great Powers, and the appearance on the world-scene of one major figure, the United States of America, far outstripping all other States in the various elements, physical, industrial, administrative and social, which together constitute political power in the mid-twentieth-century world.

The prize of world empire for which there have been so many contenders in the past, from Alexander the Great to Napoleon and Hitler, is within the grasp of the descendants of the Pilgrims and their fellow citizens. But they have no inclination to seize it. The people of the United States have no taste for Empire. Already they have made it unmistakably clear that they wish to exercise the responsibilities, suddenly cast upon them, under the rule of Law and through the instrumentality of the United Nations. Thus the problem set for us by the new constellation of international relations is that of making the United Nations an effective agency for the functioning of law on the world level, or, in other words, of transforming the diplomatic atmosphere, which it and its predecessor, the League of Nations, took over from the old European system into the constitutional atmosphere to which Americans and other Western peoples are accustomed in their own national surroundings.

This transformation will not be effected easily, and it is very necessary that Christians, and especially Protestants, should realize what it involves: for it closely concerns the Protestant concept of law and the Protestant origins of modern democracy.

Let me state the problem in the clearest terms.

The discovery of atomic energy and the predominance of the United States have made it inevitable that there should be a single peace-keeping authority in the world. The American people desire that this authority shall exercise its power under the law. The issue which remains to be decided is as to the nature and quality of that law. Will world law be imposed upon the peoples from above by an authority removed from their control? Or will it be law of the kind with which the English-speaking and other Western peoples are familiar, interpreted and enforced by magistrates amenable to the democratic process?

Let us consider this issue in the perspective of the history of the Western world.

The question of the nature and quality of law was very familiar to the Greeks. It was as familiar to the fifth-century Athenians as it is to the American public of today, which turns to its daily newspaper every Tuesday to see what action the Supreme Court has taken at its Monday sitting to keep the Executive and the Legislature in their places.

But between the era of the Greek city-states and the growth of true civic consciousness in the West, constitutionalism fell into a long slumber from which, even today, the greater part of mankind has not awakened. It came to be accepted as an axiom that large-scale government and popular control were inherently incompatible. Thus, when Augustus decided to establish a settled peace throughout the lands that had been conquered or annexed by Roman power, it never occurred to him to try to develop a constitutional system on a

representative basis. On the contrary, he allowed the institutions of the Roman city-state to fall into decay and governed the Roman dominions through a central administration, an imperial bureaucracy, which was guided, not by the will of the governed, but by general principles drawn up by Roman jurisconsults out of their own wisdom and that of the Stoic philosophers with whom they had gone to school.

Thus the Roman Empire began as a benevolent despotism and ended, as despotisms always do, in anarchy.

A similar fate befell the restored Roman Empire instituted by Charlemagne. So the territorial sovereignties which replaced the medieval system were cradled in irresponsibility. There has never yet been in the West an international constitutional system or anything remotely resembling it; and Roman law, so-called, when it spread over central Europe from the Universities at the Renaissance, strengthened the prevailing tendency to regard law as a command from above rather than as what it is for us as Protestant Christians, a civic discipline, self-imposed and self-enforced. It is no accident that the countries whose social framework is constituted by Roman law are the countries in which it has been most difficult for democracy to take root, or that tyrants should have made such easy play with the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe, accustomed from time immemorial to obey the commands of superior power.

Do not let us, therefore, imagine that the task of setting the United Nations upon the road of constitutional development will be easy. Morally and intellectually, the case for it is unanswerable. It is proclaimed in the very title-deed of the United Nations, in the choice of the word 'Charter'. But, apart from bureaucratic and other obstacles which will need to be overcome in the narrowly political realm, the psychological difficulties will be considerable. For it means asking one group of peoples, not all of them situated in the Old World, to overcome an age-long attitude towards law, and asking another group of peoples to expand their political consciousness and habitually regard world affairs from a global rather than a more limited viewpoint.

Here is a task in which Christians have surely a leading part to play. It is imposed upon us as Christians by our duty to our neighbour in the One World setting of the Atomic Age, and by our Christian heritage. For the representative institutions, which Augustus failed to develop, came into existence a few centuries later through the initiative of Christians in many separate lands and congregations who felt the need for closer unity and mutual counsel. Especially is the task incumbent upon us as Protestants: for it is the very essence of our faith and tradition to stand out against the claims of centralizing power, whether international, national or local, and

to promote methods of self-government in free and neighbourly co-operation. Our difficulty in the past has been to discover how to combine the liberty which we refuse to forego with a measure of external unity sufficient—and no more than sufficient—to promote the growth of a common consciousness and sense of fellowship between congregations and churches whose local circumstances, characteristics and outlooks, themselves the outcome of free development, are widely different. This is exactly the difficulty with which statesmanship is faced in the United Nations in the task of blazing a new American trail, in place of the abandoned Roman highway, towards world unity and world peace.

We come now to the third and last of the major changes which we are called upon to face—the new situation in Asia and Africa.

Here, again, we are confronted with the reversal of a trend: but in this case it is a trend going back, not four or five hundred, but fourteen or fifteen hundred years. For it was in the fourth century of the Christian era that Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire, the predominant political power of that day, and the connection then formed between Cæsar and the Christian Church continued substantially unbroken till yesterday. During the whole of that period, predominant political power was centred in Western Europe, first in the lands bordering on the Mediterranean and then farther North. Today, that once imperial region is beginning to assume for the statesman the appearance which it has always had for the geographer, that of a Westerly protuberance of the land-mass of the Eastern hemisphere. Power has passed from it and has become lodged across the Atlantic in a land where Cæsar and Church have never been, and constitutionally never can be, associated; thus it is chiefly under the influence of American Christianity, with its Free Church tradition, that the relations between the West and the peoples of Asia and Africa will henceforward be shaped and developed.

In this connection we cannot and ought not to ignore the effects of this American influence upon Christians of the Roman Communion, opening out, as it does, the vision, far distant though it may be, of the resumption, in some form suited to the conditions of our age, of its own representative tradition, discontinued four hundred years ago. But this raises issues which I have no time to pursue further.

The breaking of the chain, which has so long kept Christianity tied to the chariot wheel of secular officialdom, represents an immense liberation. There has indeed been only one such liberation comparable with it in the Christian record—that of the Protestant Reformation. But the Reformation was, as we all know, woefully incomplete on the political side, owing to the backwardness of political thought, including specifically Christian political thought,

at that time. Today we Christians have the opportunity, under far more favourable circumstances than 400 years ago, to make a fresh start, sweeping away the dead wood which encumbers the ground, breaking loose from much in traditional Christian thinking and practice, which has been devitalizing for Christians themselves and a stumbling-block to men and women of other faiths.

Nowhere will the effects of this liberation be more health-giving and beneficent than in our relations with the Christians of Asia and Africa, faced as they are with the task of developing their own Free Churches. And nowhere are we Western Christians faced with a more urgent and responsible task.

More than half of the population of the globe lives in South Eastern Asia, including China. Throughout that area, with its crowded masses, the one dominant influence, now and for some time to come, is and will be nationalism. This is the natural and inevitable reaction of peoples, who had been living for generations under a humiliating sense of inferiority, in face of the pride, the prejudice and, too often, the crude biological fallacies of their white superiors.

Yet the West has had much to give to these peoples and, speaking in this country, where 1776 still means so much more to most than the crowning mercy of 1787, may I be allowed to recall how much the peoples of Asia have received, for their own enrichment, from their European overlords—from Britain, France, Holland and Portugal? Let me illustrate this briefly out of my own personal experience. Among the many hundreds of graduate students, comprising some forty nationalities, encountered in the sixteen years' activity of the Geneva School of International Studies, the one whom I should pick out as having the finest intellect—he was also what would be called in this country a grand person—hailed from French Indo-China, a native of Annam, in whom Chinese and French culture has been united in a perfect blend. A Portuguese consular official stationed in a European capital, admitted to the School on his academic qualifications, turned out to be an Indian from Goa, a Roman Catholic with Christian roots going far back into the past. One of my most cherished memories is that of a conversation at Leiden with the lamented Professor Van Vollenhoven, who devoted his life to the study of Indonesian customary law, in order that the many and diverse peoples of those far-flung islands might be enabled to live under a system of true law rather than under the prescriptions of an alien system of society. As for my own country, India herself has pronounced the verdict. By their recent decision in the Indian Constituent Assembly, taken by an overwhelming majority, to renew their connection with Great Britain and to extend it to include the other Western members of the British Commonwealth, the Indian people have borne unmis-

takable testimony at once to their desire to develop their national life along the lines of Western constitutionalism and to their appreciation of the value of what they have received from their British rulers, however clumsily the gift may sometimes have been proffered to them. It took the people of the Thirteen Colonies eleven years to move forward from the negative stage of liberation to the positive stage of constitution-making and the charting of their political future. It has taken India less than four.

Meanwhile the Western partners in this new association which will span the gulf between East and West have themselves had to face readjustments, psychological as well as constitutional, which were in some ways even more disconcerting. For, in order to make ready the family mansion for the new members of their intimate group, they have had to change the image and superscription over its door—to obliterate the words 'British' and 'Empire', words which recall centuries of history and give flow to powerful currents of justifiable national pride. This sacrifice we have made—and made willingly. We have cut the words out as dead wood, thus breaking, openly and completely, with our imperial past—imperial but never really Roman—in the sure faith that England and the whole Commonwealth will be all the better without them, stronger and healthier for carrying on the work that lies before us in the Atomic Age.

Are we ready as Christians to make a similar break with what is outworn in our past? Dare we face the task laid inescapably upon us as we enter the Atomic Age, of cutting out our own dead wood? Or shall we say that what men have already accomplished in the realm of Cæsar is too much to ask of the Christian Churches?

This brings me to the practical questions—again let me emphasize the word questions—which I wish to lay before you as resulting from the foregoing analysis of the world situation. Before I unfold them, let me make very clear the spirit in which they are drawn up. My one and only desire is to render service in what seems to me a moment both of grave emergency and of unique opportunity. There is no shadow of criticism involved of those who have borne the burden and heat of labouring in this field during the last two generations, from the Edinburgh Conference onward. Laying foundations is a lengthy and toilsome task and the foundations of the Ecumenical Movement have been well and truly laid. But the building erected upon them must be suited to the conditions of the new age which has come upon us since the plans were first drawn. They need to be revised, with their proportions altered and enlarged. May I go further and say that we need to enlarge our whole outlook and to think of the work of the churches in terms of a new dimension —a dimension inconceivable to Brent and Soderblom and even yesterday to Temple and Paton and Aggrey? But how these

pioneers would rejoice in the new vista opened out to us, were they with us in the body today!

In the questions which I am going to put I will ignore material considerations. I am well aware that the present resources of the Movement are inadequate even for the work to which it is already committed. But, as Christians, we know that the first thing needed in planning an enterprise is to have the faith that can move mountains. The next is to have vision—that is, to know what particular mountain we wish to move and where we want to place it. Only third comes the question of how to move it, the problem of ways and means.

The Ecumenical Movement is at present enclosed in a vicious circle. It cannot achieve results until it is better known and it cannot become better known until it can show results. As Mr. Goodall has put it, in the April issue of *The Congregational Quarterly,* the average church member, and even the average minister or missionary, is "invincibly" ignorant about it. The only way to break out of this vicious circle is to look at the whole issue in a quite new way.

Whenever I travel between New England and Washington by the Hell Gate route, I gaze with wonder on that amazing system of road and rail bridges and viaducts which spans the bays and creeks of that indented region, and I cannot help thinking of what it must have looked like before the engineers took it in hand and how audacious their plans must have seemed when they were first blueprinted. Today most people travel over the route and profit by its convenience without stopping to consider what a revolution it represents. Just so, to take an example from my own University, we have come to take for granted at Oxford the benefits accruing from the will of Cecil Rhodes, another blueprint of a system of roads and bridges across land and sea, as bold in its sweep and as revolutionary in its consequences as that of the Hell Gate planners. It is with such examples in my mind that I have drawn up the following questions.

When we take a broad view of the field of Christian action in the conditions of the Atomic Age, does it not seem to divide itself naturally into five distinct realms each with its own set of problems and activities—intercourse, leadership, learning, policy and information?

Is not the first realm, and the primary need, that of intercourse? We speak much of communion between the Churches, but do even the leading members of the Churches — the 150 Churches in 44 countries — really know one another personally? What opportunities are there for them to get on close terms and to form those relationships of mutual confidence and intimate understanding which are essential for the inner strength and cohesion of any

movement? Can such bonds be knit on conference platforms or at committee tables or even in the few hours available outside the actual sittings of a business meeting? Are not quieter surroundings needed to enable these relationships to ripen? And, if this is so, why should not an attempt be made to meet this need in a large way, particularly for the younger generation of active workers in the Movement? Indeed, when we compare the opportunities open to the average minister for foreign travel and the enlargement of his horizon with those available, say, to University teachers—not to speak of business executives—could it not be suggested to the individual churches and congregations to consider the idea of a Sabbatical year for ministers, to be spent, as a general rule, in a foreign country? Would not this be the simplest and quickest way of overcoming the apathy deplored by Mr. Goodall and of bringing the Ecumenical Movement and the kindred political concept of One World into every congregation? Why should we not look forward to the day when the visiting minister will be as familiar a figure in the parish as the visiting professor has become on the University campus?

If this would be valuable for those already in established positions, would it not be still more valuable for those in the formative stage of their lives and careers? Do we not need something comparable to the Rhodes Scholarship to enable students of theology to spend some time outside their own confines and beyond the influence of their own particular conventicle? It does not at all follow that this would lead such students to change their opinions: indeed, they ought to be sufficiently sure of where they stand before they are chosen to go abroad. 'Personality precedes co-operation' is a maxim as true in the theological field as in any other. But would they not acquire the capacity—a capacity which, like swimming, once acquired is never lost—to understand and appreciate attitudes and opinions formed in surroundings different from their own? Is not this often missing in present-day international gatherings, and does not this go far to explain the vehemence with which differing views sometimes impinge upon one another in public—producing bewilderment among the non-initiated and mockery among non-believers?

Is not the problem next in order that of leadership? Do we not need to consider, very carefully, in the light of the conditions of the Atomic Age, the type of organization best fitted to serve a world-wide movement of associated, but not federated, churches—a Commonwealth of Churches, if I may borrow a term from a kindred association in the realm of Cæsar? Have we fully thought out what it means for Christians to step out into the world, for the first time since the Reformation, as a united body, resuming, after a lapse of many centuries, the conciliar tradition to which we owe the name

and the concept of Christendom? When we pass in review the range and complexity of the problems on which those responsible for the guidance of the Movement will be continually called upon to exercise their judgment, are we not compelled to ask whether it has not become essential that it should command the full-time services of a group of representative leaders, sitting together as an executive or cabinet? Is it not a truism of political science that in any social organization, whether it be a club, a city council, or a national government, matters constantly arise which call for executive decisions? And does not this occur quite as frequently—to say the least—on the international level as in bodies with a more limited range of action? Has not Maitland warned us, in one of his most pregnant aphorisms, that 'Power becomes secreted in the interstices of procedure'? Can we resist the conclusion that the Movement requires an executive permanently installed at headquarters? And should it not also be equipped with representative machinery, perhaps on a regional basis, so that the members of this inner group of leaders would be drawn from all parts of the world, from the East and from Africa as well as from the West? Would not such continuous daily co-operation on each problem as it arose provide one means—and a very compelling means—for cementing those personal relationships between church leaders of which the Movement stands so much in need? And would it not also be the best and indeed, constitutionally speaking, the only sound method for maintaining a close and lively relationship between the authorities at the centre and the individual congregations and church members at the circumference? How else can we hope to prevent the joints of the Movement from growing stiff and to ensure that it should remain true to the Protestant heritage of democracy and self-government?

When we pass from the sphere of action to the sphere of thought, should we not do well to consider Policy and Information within the larger frame of reference designated as Learning? And should we not approach the intellectual realm, not with the defensive and apologetic attitude to which, in England at any rate, non-Christian intellectuals have long been accustomed (with some conspicuous exceptions) in Christian speakers and writers, but with the assurance, derived from inner experience, that true religion and sound learning are indissolubly associated in the life of a Christian scholar? Has not the time come to cease from the practice, so irritating to the non-believer, of manifesting a childlike excitement over a favourable expression of opinion from some thinker who has become interested in Christianity from the outside, from Bernard Shaw or H. G. Wells, from Jeans and Eddington, from Jung and Whitehead, and for conveying to our congregations and to the world in general the sense that we stand erect and well equipped on our own intellectual, as well as spiritual, foundations?

Ought we not, as Protestants, to consider very seriously how it is that we have fallen into this defensive attitude? Why is it that we have left it to others to blaze the intellectual trail, while we follow deferentially in the rear, racking our brains for some way of reconciling the new discovery, not with our own living faith but with a stale and devitalized residuum of dogma? Have we not allowed this to happen time and again in the last four centuries? What did we do to answer Descartes and Spinoza in the seventeenth century, Leibnitz and Voltaire in the eighteenth, Bentham, Auguste Comte and the biologists in the nineteenth? Are we effective even today in face of aberrations of Existentialism and Logical Positivism?

There was indeed one great Christian answer to Descartes, the answer of Pascal. But why was he not backed up? Why has he been allowed to remain an isolated and little regarded figure? And where are the Pascals of today?

The answer to this last question is, no doubt, that they are issuing in growing numbers from the theological seminaries and University faculties of individual countries, not least in this country. But can we, as a Movement, rest content with this? Should we not aim at some broader and more comprehensive type of institution? Has not the time come when we should contemplate the foundation of an international School of Theology and kindred studies, a place where students, young and old, gathered from the length and breadth of a revivified Christendom, would hold high converse together, keeping up that never-ending dialogue between the soul and the outer world which has been the essential function of the University, from Plato's Academy, through the medieval foundations, down to the more complex institutions of the present day?

If this reproach can be cast at us in the realm of philosophy, are we not exposed to equal if not even severer criticism in the realm of applied religion, the realm of the social sciences? What have Christians had to say, as Christians, about the transformation that has taken place in our civilization during the last two centuries, to go no further back? What has been our response to the successive challenges of the industrial revolution that has affected country after country from the late eighteenth century onwards, to European nationalism and materialistic socialism in the nineteenth and to the tyrannical régimes of the present day with their revival of slavery and torture and other Dark Age practices? What have we done to keep watch over such developments in their early stages, to guide and channel them, so as to restrain them from excess, and, above all, to relate them, in thought and action, to the larger movement of the world as a whole? Or, to take one particular field, have we, as Christians, exercised the forethought that the world had a right to expect of us, in watching and keeping the public informed about the

social consequences of scientific inventions? When we think of the use to which the invention of printing was put in the time of Erasmus, can we face without shame the early origins and whole development of the moving picture? And what had we to say about housing and town-planning, when industrialism was crowding the Western peoples into what the sociologists today describe in retrospect as 'Palæolithic Smoketowns'? Are we even sufficiently alert today in dealing with the implications of the far-reaching decision of the United States Government to promote the economic development of the backward areas of the world?

When we consider how much has been allowed to go by default for the lack of any comprehensive and organized body of Christian thinking, ought we not to turn our minds to the undertaking of an organized effort, on the international plane, to think out the attitude and the practical approach which Christians should adopt towards such problems—problems of equal interest to the sociologist and the statesman, but on which they too seldom have occasion to put their minds together? Should we not contemplate the creation, under the auspices of the Movement but under autonomous direction, of a Christian Institute of Social Research, staffed by men and women whose names would command equal respect in the academic and the practical world? Would not this be a characteristic Christian variety of the Hell Gate type of engineering?

As we pass from organization to policy, should not our first reaction be a sense of our present insufficiency? When the ecumenical Rhodes Scholarship system and the Christian Institute of Social Research have been functioning for a generation, will not Church leaders be in a far better position to frame policies and to issue pronouncements on immediate issues than they are at the present time? Do we not need, all of us, leaders and congregations alike, to go through a period of becoming better acquainted with the limitations of our knowledge and the fallibility of our own opinions and judgments? Would it not be one of the principal tasks of a central executive to exercise a restraining influence on the impetuosity of individual churches and church leaders, pointing out to them the pitfalls into which their inexperience is in danger of leading them and putting them on guard against the wiles of these most insidious enemies of the Faith, those for whom religion is simply a mystique—if you will allow me to use that detestable term—an instrument of propaganda to be used without shame or scruple for the furtherance of some particular earthly, very earthly, cause? Do we not all recall occasions in which the naïveté of our fellow-Christians has thus been exploited and their enthusiasm turned to uses on which it is not pleasant to look back in the light of later history?

In view of such experiences, should we not conclude that the

principal function of the Movement, in the realm of policy, might well be to ensure that no policy should be put forward or collective action taken until it has been fully discussed, in its bearings upon the different churches and countries concerned, by the representative Christian leaders? This would not, of course, preclude action by individual churches or federations of churches and other regional groups. But would not the existence of the central executive make it much more likely than it is at present that such action would be taken with an appreciation of all the relevant factors involved?

Moreover, would not the greater care exercised in the issuing of pronouncements lend a proportionately greater weight to the voice of the Movement as a whole on the rare occasions when a united Christian opinion felt such a pronouncement to be called for? Are we not in danger today of losing our sense of proportion, of confounding what is local and ephemeral with what is universal and of abiding importance and—what is a still greater danger in the life of the Christian community—of encouraging our fellow-Christians to let their minds wander over the length and breadth of this world during the too short moments when they should be united in looking upwards? Certainly we Christians need to be concerned with world affairs. But let us not treat them as stones to be offered to Christian congregations in place of the Living Bread.

Does not this lead us, by a natural transition, to the problem of how to keep Christians better informed about world affairs and the life of their respective countries? Should we not, as a Movement, be far better provided than we have been in the past with means for procuring such information? Ought we not to think seriously of setting on foot a quarterly Review, with a small central editorial committee and a body of correspondents scattered throughout the world, so as to keep Christians in touch with one another on a plane other than that of day by day happenings and news items? Might not these correspondents themselves in course of time gather round them groups of public-spirited Christian men and women who would come to exercise a real influence in their respective communities? Should we not in this way be served with an organ comparable in the quality of its articles and the comprehensiveness of its outlook with *Foreign Affairs* in this country and in the world-wide network of its regular contributors with the *Round Table* in Great Britain—two journals which, for a generation or more, without taking sides on controversial issues, have exercised a great enlightening and moderating influence on and beyond their countries of publication? And would not this leave the *International Review of Missions* and the existing national journals more free to devote themselves to the specifically religious field?

This brings us to the end of our five-fold exploration. My quiver has been emptied of questions and now I await your answers.

THE MESSAGE TO THE CHURCHES

To the members of the Churches of the International Congregational Council:-

Greeting, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

THE members of the churches of the Congregational order throughout the world are Christians who believe profoundly in freedom and fellowship in Christ Jesus our Lord. We believe that where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty—liberty for the individual, for the churches, and for that free association of the churches which is the Church. Such freedom is an inalienable right, not by the grant of society, but because all freedom is derived of God, and resides in the free consent of the people of God who accept it with humility and with responsibility, remembering that due account of our use of this gift must be rendered unto the Giver.

Because this liberty is a grant by God to all His children who accept its obligations, there is laid upon us both the necessity and the privilege of fellowship, association, and co-operation in the matters which pertain to the welfare of man and the glory of God. This is the work and witness of the churches, and for so great a task we must join our personal liberty to the liberty of the fellowship of kindred minds, remembering that while only the free are strong, only the strong are free. Our strength in our work and witness, in an age which seeks strength through coercion of mind and spirit by irresponsible power, is found in that devotion to each other, and to our common cause of loyalty to Christ as Lord and Saviour, given by that free consent in which we are firmly bound, forever free.

In this high calling of freedom in fellowship we speak this message of the nature and programme of our faith as it is commonly held among us.

Our Witness to the Design and Will of God

I

The Church owes its existence to Good News. This News discloses God's grand design for the children He has created and the universe in which He has given us life. "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life". "I am come that they might have Life and overflow with it". Whatever the circumstances into which we are born, each one of us can say "We are His offspring". Our life in this world is only part—though a supremely important part—of a destiny which has the eternities as its setting.

The supreme act which discloses this Design—the life, death and resurrection of Christ—is News which carries with it rebuke and judgment. The Cross lays bare our ignorance, blunderings and sin, shatters our self-confidence and breaks our hearts. Yet even while this News rebukes, it remains *Good* News. "For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world but that the world through Him might be saved". The Design of God has at its centre God's own redeeming act. Confronting us with the particularity of His coming to us in Christ, He moves the heart with wonder, and stirs the world with hope.

The central point in God's design is the act of God in Christ, a particular event in history. But this centre is a living centre, a dynamic centre. The Revealer and Saviour is alive for evermore. He is not far from any one of us. It is with wonder, love and praise that, as Congregationalists, we base our churchmanship on the amazing assurance that "where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them". As the reality of this assurance comes home to us in the worship and fellowship of the church we see into the meaning of eternity, and know that we are being made "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light". Yet in the same experience the things of time become more vivid and our responsibilities in relation to them more compelling. Christ, His promises and commands, sets the requirements for our behaviour, personal, social and international. More and more do we perceive that God has summed up all things in Christ, things in heaven and upon earth.

II

As Congregationalists we stand in the central Christian tradition, acknowledging the living faith first delivered to the saints and rejoicing in our oneness with Christ's people everywhere. God, in His grace, has created the Church by calling men into fellowship with Himself and with each other in order to realize in the world His Kingdom of truth, righteousness and love. While Congregationalists do not require subscription to any man-made creedal statements they have ever been loyal to the great doctrines of the Christian faith and have always claimed their place in the witness of the evangelical, reformed Churches. At the same time they have stood, and still stand, for religious liberty under the Gospel and in obedience to the Gospel.

We acknowledge Christ to be the sole Head of the Church. We believe that where He is present among His people there is all that is essential to a Church. Thus each community of believers is the Catholic Church in essence and is empowered by Christ to govern its own life under the guidance of His Spirit. Its members are ministers to each other of the grace of God and may perform such functions within the Church as may be committed to them

by the Church. Within this priesthood of believers some are called by God to proclaim the Word, administer the Sacraments, tend the flock of God, build up the household of faith and win men to Christ. Ordination is to the ministry of the Universal Church. Therefore we cannot contemplate any form of union which would call in question the validity of our present orders.

We believe that the rule of Christ in His Church is by persuasion and not by coercion. In the assembly of Christ's people authority is always spiritual, working through brotherly love. This principle applies throughout the entire government of the Church, from the local Church Meeting to the most inclusive Council. We consider it to be the root principle by which the World Council of Churches may draw the separated branches of the One Church out of their shameful division into closer unity. We acknowledge with penitence that we ourselves have often failed to walk by this light. In the setting of the ecumenical movement we long to discover how the authority of the Spirit may be brought more effectively to bear upon the widest reaches of our common life and upon the government of our Churches. We rejoice both to give and to receive within the world-wide fellowship of the Church of Christ.

We have little to give to the world unless we are creating communities of love through which God's care and concern can reach out to redeem men and transform society. We therefore call our people, in the name of Christ, to renewed trust in God, deeper dependence upon His Holy Spirit, and more costly and adventurous service on behalf of His children.

III

Though the Church owes its existence to this Good News concerning the design of God, it ceases to be the Church unless it is also the bearer of this Good News to those who have never heard it or never received it. At the supreme moment of the Church's life—its worship—there comes the most compelling commission of our discipleship to witness to the ends of the earth. It is the Risen Lord who, meeting His worshipping disciples, says "All power is given unto me in heaven and upon earth. *Go ye therefore . . .*"

As Congregationalists we rejoice to have shared in the "the great century" of missions through the Societies which are specially dependent upon us, the L.M.S., the A.B.C.F.M., the Colonial Missionary Society, the Societies for Missions at Home, and the work of the younger churches which, under God, have come into being with the help of these Societies. In fellowship with Missions representing other denominational traditions, whose work is inextricably bound up with ours, we give thanks for the mighty achievements of the last 150 years. Yet the great numerical advances of the Church have to be set alongside the fact of the world's increase of population, and the fact remains that the number of non-Christians in the world is

larger than in the days when our forefathers, under an overwhelming sense of urgency, founded the missionary societies in whose record we proudly rejoice. It is, therefore, with renewed concern that we urge our local churches to test the validity of their churchmanship by surveying afresh the share which they are taking in the world mission of the Church. We also urge that, as the process continues by which the wider organs of Congregationalism (County Unions, State Associations and Conferences, National Unions and Councils) are made to serve the central purposes of the Church, it should be made clear that our emphasis on local privilege carries with it an acknowledgment of world obligation. For us, the local church is not only the focusing point of the Church universal: it is the base from which the love and service of a gathered people are sent into all the world in the power of a Risen Lord.

Although it is thus with a sharpened sense of obligation that we think in geographical terms of the unevangelized areas of the world, we are no less conscious of the new missionary obligation which lies close to all our doors and at the very heart of the contemporary society of which we and our Churches are part. Through the manifold yet common needs which meet us here, Christ is calling us to go into all *this* world, many of whose assumptions and practices run counter to the grand design of God for humanity. The renewed summons to missionary service which we address to all our Churches is one which bids a new generation of Christians recognize the increasing areas, not only of non-Christian religion, but of materialism and secularism, both at home and overseas, and respond to the call of Christ anew with the sacrificial abandonment of those who know that to this end have they been born, and for this cause came they into the world.

The Witness of the Church in Society and in the International Order

I

We approach the disorder of society firm in the faith that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of men and the Lord of history, and that He shall reign in mercy and judgment in all the timelessness of the world of God. Upheld by this faith we pray for the coming of His Kingdom, and go forth to be used by Him for accomplishing His purpose in the social settings of our day.

Within all the social orders of human history—clan, feudal, communist, socialist, fascist, and capitalist—there has been, and always will be, the tendency among those who hold power to succumb to the evil tendency of power to corrupt those who seek their own interest above the interest of others who are sharers in the same society. The social message of the Christian Gospel has always recognized that all systems are formed by human nature, and therefore are conditioned by that nature. The Gospel comes to us, not to frame our temporary systems, but to confront us with

eternal values. It places the highest value upon the integrity of the man's personality as a child of God, and declares that it were better that a millstone be hung about a man's neck, and he be drowned, than that he should harm or destroy one of these for the power, the vain-glory, or profit of any individual, group, or state.

All social systems must come under the directive and the judgment of the Gospel, and must be those which never consider men, women and children as serfs, opportunities for exploitation, or "hands"; but always as persons. A Christian system must grant the fullest possible measure of freedom, initiative, development of personality, an adequate share of the common wealth in the measure of accepted responsibility, and the reward of honest toil. This is not the end of purpose for man, but constitutes that open door to the spiritual spaciousness of a free society, in which a man must be responsible for the use of his talents, spiritually and physically, to the God Who gave them.

It is apparent that at present there exists a fundamental incompatibility between Christian principles and those forms of Communism which are built upon atheism and a denial of human freedom. This conflict of philosophies is in danger of becoming one of power. These forms of Communism cannot, and will not, admit any rival centre of authority which is spiritual in nature. In such a situation, which profoundly affects the Western nations, it is necessary that we should support such policies as will act as a deterrent to the more violent acts of Communist aggression. But the primary Christian tactics in this situation are to press for the development of such constructive and creative programmes as will develop areas of economic and social health throughout the world, and thus lead the Russian people, and the other peoples under Soviet control, increasingly to share in the benefits of co-operation with the Western peoples and with the United Nations.

We recognize the permanent change brought about in the field of international relations by the discovery of atomic energy with its terrible immediate potency as a military weapon, and its long-distance potentialities of beneficent peace-time use. We call upon Christian public opinion to adopt a more positive and constructive attitude in the face of this grave problem, which overclouds our civilization and threatens to subordinate our economic and social life to the needs of military defence. We consider that the only way out of the situation into which the world is being driven is to place this, and all other weapons of mass destruction, under the control of a world authority. We give our wholehearted support to the plan devised for this purpose by the United States Government, which was approved by the great majority of the members of the United Nations.

While the struggle which is now going on is a continuation of

the age-old national rivalries, even under new forms of government, the basic conflict is not one of military force but of ideologies. It is a conflict between the idea that the State is formed by man and must always be his servant, and the idea that man is the servant of the State, and this struggle cuts across even geographical and national boundaries. It is a tension which is to be found within the borders of the democratic nations themselves. Consequently, assaults against civil liberties, policies of racial discrimination and segregation and exploitation of peoples, or support of political régimes which make serfs of their people, must be understood to be aids to the acceptance of systems which promise their abolition even though the cost be that of servitude.

The Church cannot resolve the debate between those who champion various forms of economic life as alternative economic systems to Communism. No one system will prove a panacea for all the social ills that befall mankind, and each will generate its own evils. In any welfare type of economy, the Church must insist that the individual needs private property to express his liberty, and to learn to use his own belongings in service and love. In a more individualist economy, the Church must insist on justice and security for the rank and file of men and women. The free man in Christ, upon whom injustice must not be inflicted and who cannot be unjust to others, is the basic concept of Christian society, and to that free society we pledge our loyalty.

II

As Christians, we believe that the sovereignty of God extends to all spheres of human relationship. Our faith in God involves confidence in His purpose of redemption for all mankind and in the limitless resources which He continually makes available in Christ.

The exercise of power, of whatever nature, implies responsibilities which can be discharged, and temptations which can be overcome, only in the light of a deep sense of dedication and duty to God, and a vivid recognition of the Christian principle of our solidarity in sin and redemption. As Christians, it is our duty to abandon and abhor the irresponsible use of power and also the pietism which would seek to escape from these responsibilities of power. To separate the spiritual realm from the political and economic realms seems at variance with Holy Scripture and the fundamental idea of the Kingdom of God. Power is a trust for which we are accountable to God and should use in the interests of world community, ever bearing in mind the needs of those distressed in body, mind and spirit by economic stringency and the consequences of total war.

As Christians, we would strive to create a moral climate in which all nations may develop an effective sense of world community based on Christian ideals of interdependence and mutual obligation. We earnestly support the fundamental principles of the United Nations

Charter, looking forward to those measures which will make it more qualified to resolve the conflicts of the Great Powers, and hence to fulfil the great tasks committed to it. Yet no merely technical improvement in its constitution, or even in its practice, will suffice to make it effective. The problem is, in the last analysis, a spiritual one. There is no common language based on commonly accepted values. While recognizing the contributions of men of good will, we are convinced that the spread of the Christian Gospel and the growing realization of the power of the Christian dynamic are essential, if the peoples of the world are to be psychologically and spiritually prepared for world unity. Meantime we welcome and support any regional associations within the ambit of the United Nations, if genuinely aimed at the restoration of order and the maintenance of peace and freedom. We recognize that the establishment of true international law involves the acknowledgment of a supra-national authority armed with sufficient power to repel agression and promote the common welfare. In proportion as this is achieved, the progressive reduction of national armaments should follow.

We meet at a time when many of our brother-men and sister-Churches are bearing great burdens of material and spiritual distress. We commend to the prayers and action of our Churches the homeless, the imprisoned, the persecuted and the fearful, the hungry and the naked, in many lands. We urge that by a deepening of our spiritual fellowship, an extension of our material aid and any and every good form of witness and renunciation, we should seek to develop that strategy of reconciliation which the times require and our Lord enjoins. To this end we urge our Churches to welcome and encourage, with Christian understanding, such experiments and adventures in discipleship, whether in the reconciliation of separate nations or of opposing social forces, as God may inspire. As a witnessing Church looks out upon the world today, both the burden of the world's needs and the immensity of the Church's world mission are seen to be more formidable than ever. It would be vain for us to send out this call to confident, expectant evangelism except for one fact—we do so in the name of Him who gave Himself for the redemption of the world and whose Kingdom is everlasting.

The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.

For the Council: 24 June, 1949. Wellesley, Massachusetts.

Russell J. Clinchy, U.S.A., Chairman.

Sidney Maurice Watts, England.
Charles S. Duthie, Scotland.
Henry David Gray, U.S.A.
Truman B. Douglass, U.S.A.
Muriel Olympia Paulden, England.
Norman Goodall, England.
Herman Johan Heering, Holland.
John C. Bennett, U.S.A.
Gordon A. Sisco, Canada.
Elfan Rees, Wales.
Edward S. Kiek, Australia.

IMPRESSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

(1) By L. Hector Read

The delegates from Britain to the Sixth International Congregational Council, from the moment of their meeting one another on the boat train at Waterloo Station, became quickly aware of their oneness in fellowship, a fellowship which deepened as we journeyed by sea and land to Wellesley. To that fellowship was added a larger meaning and purpose as we became one company with our fellow delegates from many lands at the Council meetings. The memory of it all must be numbered among the richest gains to our future life and witness in our several churches.

The work of the Council burst upon us with a suddenness which left us gasping. It was unfortunate that we were without knowledge of the details of the Conference agenda until we arrived at Wellesley. To have had some information as to the topics to be discussed and the procedure of the Conference would have added to our preparedness and have given us an opportunity to make a fuller contribution to the discussions than was the case. It should be said, however, that the British delegation did not fail to play an important part in furthering the purpose for which we had assembled.

On board the *Queen Elizabeth* on our outward voyage, we were privileged to have with us as a travelling companion Dr. David McKeith, the newly appointed secretary of the American Board of Foreign Missions. On the Sunday afternoon of 12th June he addressed the British delegates and gave us considerable information about the merger which is to be consummated between the Evangelical and Reformed and the Congregational Churches in the United States of America. It would appear that many of the problems facing American Congregationalism are similar to those confronting us here in England. One other thing we gathered from his talk is that central authority in the United States is more developed than it is with us. This is manifest from the fact that the majority approval of the merger was given at the national level and not at the level of the local churches.

* * *

Our arrival in New York on Monday, 13th June, brought us an early taste of the hospitality extended to us by our American friends. There were moments when it became almost overwhelming. It has left us with a sense of indebtedness for kindnesses received, which it would be impossible for us, in these days of British austerity, to match. The generosity of the entertainment we received in the homes of the people, wherever we went, was beyond praise.

The opening of the Council with a service—followed by communion—when the Rev. Leslie E. Cooke preached on "The Prophetic Word of the Church", was a great occasion and did much to create the fine atmosphere in which the Council proceedings moved forward happily. The theme of the Council, "Freedom and Fellowship through Christ", was at the back of all our minds as the discussions proceeded day by day. That we were able on the first day, after some debate and amendment, to approve the constitution, was no small achievement. The statement on Congregationalism and its significance for the world today, presented by Dr. Peel and adopted, gave rise to hopes which were never fulfilled. This was unfortunate since the subsequent pressure of matters for discussion each day robbed the delegates of the opportunity of the kind of conference and debate which might have produced rich results. The question as to whether Congregationalism has any particular witness of significance for the world today seemed to some of us, viewing the circumstances in which we were gathered, to be of more vital importance than that of trying to find a formula to account for the ills of the world. One often felt that we were losing valuable time in an attempt to over-simplify the age-old problem of good and evil. If one belonged to one order of society, all would be well, but if to another order, then evil would result, whereas the fundamental fact that each individual has good and evil present in his being was the thing which had to be faced. As the Conference progressed we seemed to move away from the consideration of our essential Congregationalism and the part it has to play in the modern situation, and to give greater heed to the setting up of organizations than to the question of the responsibility of the individual in dealing with the problem of the world's disorder. Why is it necessary, when considering the Universal Church in God's Design, to have it suggested that Congregationalism is dissolving before our eyes? Is it because the individual has lost his faith, and is no longer able to carry his responsibility in the daily work of the Church? This point was not really considered by the Council and yet, how important it is, when one considers the theme of the Conference!

The speeches throughout the Conference, particularly those given at the evening sessions, were of a high order. Although they were so different in character and delivery, yet running through all was the thought of man's need and of God's answer. It was left to the last of the speakers at the evening sessions, Sir Alfred Zimmern, to bring us face to face with some of the realities of the present situation as it affects us as Congregationalists. He recalled us to the fact that we were at a moment of great emergency and great opportunity. It was good for us, he said, to be associated, but not in federated association, since power tends to become secreted in

large organizations. World-wide organization is dangerous in the extreme. Sir Alfred reminded us of our Protestant heritage of self-government. The question his speech put to us was whether we realized what we were doing, and where we were going. His was a salutary reminder that there is danger in organization where the individual may be so easily swamped.

It is difficult to give a general impression of such a vital conference where so much was packed into so short a time. The mind tended to suffer from mental indigestion from all the strong meat it had received. The question, Was it worth while? seems obvious. The answer is that it was. One has to confess, however, that it might have been even more worth while. The experience of the fellowship between our own delegates and our fellow-Congregationalists from other countries would itself have been justification for the Conference. It was in this fellowship we learned of so much that is being done in other lands and came to understand that the problems which confront us also confront others. If more time could have been made available for informal conferences and discussions the value of the Council meetings would have been greatly enhanced. We learned that there is a wider interpretation to be put upon Congregationalism than we, ourselves, tend to give it.

Remark has been made as to the high quality of the prepared speeches and the lack of quality in the general debates. In view of this it should be emphasized that the latter was largely due to the want of opportunity to enable the delegates to give previous consideration to the subject matters which came up for consideration. It was a matter of common complaint among the British delegates on their way to the Council that in the absence of any programme they had no time to think together and to prepare themselves for the task to which they were journeying so far. Had some pre-knowledge of the subject matter to be discussed been available to us on the voyage over, it is certain that the level of the general discussions would have risen considerably. As it was, we console ourselves that there may have been a natural diffidence in view of the amazing hospitality afforded the delegates from the time of their arrival in America.

To sum up, it was good to be at Wellesley. It broadened our outlook and enlarged our vision; it made us realize more than ever the vast opportunities which exist for evangelism in the world today. All this deepened the disappointment of certain among us that more time was not spent on examination of the contribution which Congregationalism has to make in helping to solve the problem of the present disorders of our world. One questions the wisdom of trying so to alter Congregationalism that it may better fit into a planned society, with all its dangers to the freedom of the individual, rather than to emphasize the value of that freedom

as exemplified in Congregationalism and practised by our forefathers. Perhaps in the days to come this will be realized and unity be better appreciated. If it should so happen, it may well be that the realization will dawn that in striving for complete union more harm than good may ensue to the Church.

(2) By Elsie Chamberlain, B.D.

Impressions of the International Congregational Council are inextricably bound up in my mind with impressions of America—and not to the detriment of the Council! In fact, when asked by a group of American women what I was going to say about them, I could truly answer—"that they were so much nicer than I expected"! They were surprised that we regularly read in our newspapers of anti-British feeling in America—as surprised as we were that they did not know that our food was still rationed.

As at Amsterdam, the need was impressed upon us for some means of circulating knowledge of ordinary Christian people. While the newspaper makes its fortune out of bad news, it seemed to us that an international Christian paper might at least pay its way on good news. That, after all, is our prerogative. Meanwhile, the friendship and understanding that began because of the Wellesley Conference will continue and grow, in informal, as well as more organized ways. The laymen have their Fellowship; the women are sending out twice a year a bulletin of international news; I, personally, have five addresses of young people who want regular news from this side, and such contacts will have been established by many others.

The warmth of our welcome and the generosity of the hospitality extended to us removed in a day any qualms we might have had about meeting anti-British feeling! The remotest English ancestors or nearest relatives were paraded, and I had to apologize for ignorance of a certain "Aunt Jane of London". The U.S.A. delegation was only one-third of the whole, but the air we breathed was American (when the temperature allowed there to be any at all), and the Congregational *ethos* that pertained to the Council was American—and we went on with our education and enjoyed it.

Our impression of American Congregationalism was, from the first glimpse, of something very different from our own. In and around New York we found wealthy churches with colossal membership, highly paid staff, and marvellous equipment (those kitchens! —like ideal homes exhibitions on a large scale). The central altar with Cross and two candles and the liturgical part of the Service would have made many an Anglican feel at home, and revealed a bridge that already spans our divisions. The experience of worshipping with, and leading in worship, congregations trained in these traditions was the greatest possible encouragement in ecumenicity.

So we arrived for the Council as agog as a charabanc of trippers.

Wellesley College was well chosen for our venue. We are sorry that its gracious and able President, Mrs. Douglas Horton, performed her last official duty there in welcoming us to its precincts, but we look to Wellesley's loss as Congregationalism's gain. The beautiful campus with its spacious lake and wooded hills provided us with breaths of air on the hottest days. And what the kitchen staff did for us is now like a dream remembered on waking!

Leaving these mundane (or celestial) things—let us look at the Council. Those who compared English and American Congregationalism and hoped to discuss it were disappointed. I was one of them. I was disappointed in that and with our preparation—or lack of it—for so big a task. But with regard to the discussion, I can admit now that what we learned in friendship we might have missed in controversy. So that although some of us felt that the actual planned conference accomplished less than we hoped, much was, in fact, being accomplished. The Holy Spirit, as someone remarked, would not have had much chance to say anything in our deliberations if He had wanted to; but I believe He was present and graciously active in unspectacular ways.

As the printed reports will show and anyone would have expected, the main addresses were well done. We listened to addresses on the four divisions of the World Council of Churches' main theme at Amsterdam. Each was dealt with theologically and then practically, and a third speaker summed up. Actually we had a third address on most occasions. Somehow individual theologians are not very good at summing up the ideas of two others!

The actual business of forming the Council and electing its officers, was carried out in the usual unbusinesslike and un-Congregational way common to Congregationalism. But there was a fine and impressive Service for the Induction of the Moderator and the commissioning of the Secretary.

American lavishness ruled the budget, and as it also provides most of the funds, it would have been churlish to damp Dr. Horton's enthusiasm for "suitable accommodation" for our International Headquarters. English standards do not prevail internationally, of course, but is there some danger that to a minimum stipend minister the set-up may appear expensive and remote from his work; especially as under the present arrangement he can never afford to be a delegate until the Church visits his home town. At present it seems that ministers in the highest stipend group—the Secretaries and Moderators—have travel expenses paid, whilst those in the lower, "ordinary minister" groups have to pay for themselves. I do not think we qualify to discuss the social implications of Christianity until we manage something more equitable by way of the pooling of resources. Incidentally such a method—or lack of

it—severely limits the choice of delegates. Had I not married a husband I could not have accepted the invitation !

Congregationalism in England is not just well-to-do-middle-class, so don't let's pretend ! And in spite of appearances, neither is it entirely so in America. I found much inspiration in a week-end spent at a little church. The whiteness of its slim spire and beautiful building was overshadowed by the wooded Adirondack Mountains that seemed to crowd round it. Here was a church alive and active in the midst of a community with an insoluble economic problem resulting from seasonal employment. It seemed more like home. I'm proud of our Jack-of-all-trades ministry. In England, religious education, psychiatry, marriage guidance, welfare work, *etc., etc.,* are the work of the minister. Grace and the job make many a man. We have a lot to learn from America about the use of specialists, but many of our churches will only be able to employ a staff of one for some time to come. Riverside, New York, I'm told, has 70 names on its pay roll !

Economically, the small church has its problems. Congregationally, it has its assets. Church Meeting just isn't practical in a membership of two or three thousand. Here is one of our contributions to the I.C.C. and W.C.C. of the future; but let's be sure it is a practical and practised one.

Of our kin in almost every continent, suffice it to say that we had fellowship with one another. In that fellowship lay the inestimable value of the Council.

Our faith has an all-embracing capacity. Our Order, we learned again, is elastic; and while the One Spirit prevails, we rejoice in the hope that Congregationalism united will have experience that is valuable to the World Church.

REVIEWS

(The place of publication is London unless stated otherwise)

The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ. By A. M. Ramsey. Longmans. 9s. 6d.

It has long been lamented that there is no book in English on the word "glory". Here is one that makes available to English readers a judicious selection of the work of German scholars and provides an interesting survey of an immense field of study. "Behind this conception there lies a fascinating piece of linguistic history, and within it are contained the greatest themes of Christian Theology" (Preface). It is evident that Professor Ramsey is more at home with the Christian theology than with the linguistic history. He moves with apparent ease through the doctrines of the New Testament faith, showing how they are bound together by the one master-concept—the glory of God. The best part of the book is an account of the progress from the Synoptic words of Jesus to the Johannine theology, which displays admirably the inner coherence of New Testament thought.

Professor Ramsey misses some of the finer points of Johannine usage: for example, the reason why Jesus prayed for the glory he had already manifested. But the main weakness of the book is that the linguistic foundation is inadequate to bear the dogmatic superstructure. Problems of semantic change receive only a passing notice. The kaleidoscopic variety of "glory" is not traced to its origin in the Hebrew concept of honour. The Hebrew verbal system receives scant justice, especially when the reflexive stem is treated as a passive. The result of this last error is that the glorification of God becomes an act of man instead of an act of God, and throughout the book the glory of God is regarded rather as a static quality than as an activity of divine grace. The effect of this weakness is most evident in the fundamentally Hebraic thought of the Fourth Gospel.

The second part of the book deals much more satisfactorily with the Transfiguration. Professor Ramsey is justly severe on those modern discussions which avoid the question of historicity as though it were unimportant. He raises afresh most of the problems of Synoptic eschatology, and provides a sound critique of G. H. Boobyer's fuller work on this subject. There is an excellent chapter on the history of Christian interpretation of the Transfiguration, and an interesting conclusion that transfiguration is typical of the Gospel. George B. Caird.

The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers. By Thomas F. Torrance, M.B.E., D.Theol., B.D. Oliver & Boyd. 12s. 6d.

This work was Dr. Torrance's thesis for the Doctorate of Theology in the University of Basel. It is a careful investigation into the subtle change which took place during the first and second centuries in the concept underlying the word *grace*.

Although only comprising 150 pages, the treatment is thorough and the book is well documented. There is an introduction dealing with the history of the word *grace* in Classical and Hellenistic Greek, and its adaptation to special significance in the New Testament. This introduction is very well

done, and Dr. Torrance moves with sure step through his maze of references. He also shows how the idea of grace is linked up with Old Testament concepts, and ends his introduction with a paragraph giving an admirable summary of the idea of grace in the New Testament. A few sentences should be quoted from that paragraph: "Grace . . . is the breaking into the world of the ineffable love of God in a deed of absolutely decisive significance which cuts across the whole of human life and sets it on a new basis. That is actualized in the person of Jesus Christ, with which grace is inseparably associated, and supremely exhibited on the Cross by which the believer is once and for all put in the right with God. . . . Under the gracious impingement of Christ through the Spirit there is a glad spontaneity about the New Testament believer. . . . He is caught up in the overwhelming love of Christ, and is concerned only about doing His will".

Dr. Torrance then proceeds to deal in order with grace as expounded in the Didache, the Epistles of Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Barnabas and Hermas. In each case the treatment is careful and adequate, and he proves his case that the high Pauline concept of grace had lost much of its content in its transmission to a generation whose outlook was objective, legalistic and naturalistic. Quite apart from his main occupation with the idea of grace, these chapters are very useful general commentaries on the works mentioned, and it is refreshing to observe that Dr. Torrance has the courage of his convictions in the face of hitherto generally accepted views. Some of his judgments may not be universally acceptable, but they are all supported by relevant evidence or argument.

His concluding chapter is only nine pages long, and one might wish that it had been longer. It would have been useful to have had a fuller analysis of the reasons for the decline from full Paulinism, and an indication of the ways in which subsequent trends in theology both took up and corrected the aberrances of the early centuries.

The work is a technical one, and is meant for the student and specialist rather than for the general reader. But anyone who wishes to form a balanced judgment on the theological trends of the first centuries must certainly take this book into account. It is a worthy contribution to its subject.

The typography is good and clear, and I have not detected a misquotation or a misplaced accent, which is no faint praise where there is so much Greek!

AUBREY R. VINE.

F. H. Bradley. By W. F. LOFTHOUSE, M.A., D.D. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

Dr. Lofthouse's study of Bradley is a labour of love. He greatly admires his philosophy, and thinks that a strong dose of it would do much good in the present unsatisfactory state of British thought, which is too much dominated by logical positivism. There is a very useful historical introduction, which places Bradley, first with reference to the positivism of Mill which ruled in Oxford just before the time of T. H. Green, and then next to the Neo-Kantianism and Neo-Hegelianism of Green and the Cairds. It is shown how Bradley himself belonged to the latter movement, and was in fact a Neo-Hegelian of sorts—he himself said that he did not know precisely how much he owed to Hegel, but it is clear that Hegel was the main source of his inspiration. There follows in Dr. Lofthouse's book an analysis of Bradley's chief works, "Ethical Studies", "Principles of Logic", "Appearance and Reality". All have a Hegelian tinge.

The essence of "Ethical Studies" is contained in the famous phrase, "my station and its duties", by which Bradley defined man's ethical task through relating him to his social environment, the organism of which he is a member. The "Principles of Logic" has for its theme the fundamental position of Reality as the true subject of all judgments, so that everything other than absolute Reality is in the end no more than an adjective applied to it. Finally, "Appearance and Reality" goes on to prove that everything except the Absolute is only appearance, in which category not only space, time and nature, but also the self and even God are included. Bradley does not propose to know how it is that the Absolute provides or contains all these appearances, but is convinced that we can know this certainly to be so.

So far then, the exposition of Bradley: as over against the modern logical positivism Dr. Lofthouse finds his position to be altogether superior. He concurs with the observation of Whitehead, that if our ancestors had been positivists, they never would have sought for reasons, and civilization would have ended before it began. All the same Dr. Lofthouse as a Christian theologian is not entirely content with Bradley. He finds fault with his agnosticism as to the origin of appearances from or in the Absolute, which he considers that only a Theistic conception of the Absolute can explain. The key is to be found, he says, in the analogy of the organism. The finite centres of experience, which Bradley reduces to appearances only, are related to the Absolute as the particular cells are related to the whole organism, so that in the Absolute their experiences are completed and harmonized, as Bradley indeed requires.

Bradley's philosophy, thus modified, is of course no longer Bradley; nevertheless there remains an Idealism which Dr. Lofthouse thinks is the only satisfactory metaphysic for Christianity. He points out that it is entirely opposed to the Barthian doctrine of the *deus absconditus* so widely prevalent now in Protestant theological circles.

It is by no means easy to summarize Bradley—his philosophy is intricate and subtle, and his brilliant epigrams are of its very essence. But Dr. Lofthouse has done what is possible, much more fully than my summary, still further reduced from his summary, might suggest. His book will serve as a good introduction to the study of the philosopher himself. But that is not all. It must be recognized that his criticism of Bradley is just—it is unsatisfactory to say that we know for certain that all but the Absolute is appearance, but yet we do not know how appearances arise. This peculiar blend of knowledge and ignorance is necessarily unstable, and must develop one way or the other, either to the positivism abhorred alike of Bradley and his expositor, or else to the Theism which the latter represents. But the questing mind of man cannot be expected permanently to accept the "thus far shalt thou go and no further" of positivism; and therefore in the end the advance to Theism seems inevitable. ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Why Religion? By T. E. JESSOP. The Bureau of Current Affairs. 2s.

If allowance is made for the inevitable limitations due to its small size, this can be said to be a very good book on the great subject of religion.

It begins with an emphasis on the massive social fact which religion still is in the world: it is pointed out that only the secularizing West in modern times has imagined it possible to do without it, and even so has not escaped its influence which has penetrated deeply into our civilization. But the question whether religion is an illusion, once raised, has to be faced.

Professor Jessop states the Theistic argument in a notably cogent way, showing in detail how the physical universe, and still more man with his ideals, demand nothing less than a Theistic explanation, and how the fact of religious experience comes in to confirm what otherwise might be regarded only as a philosophical speculation. There follows a short history of religion in which its development from a primitive form up to ethical monotheism is studied; then the great world-religions of Buddhism (with a note on Hinduism), Islam, and Christianity (with a note on Judaism) are compared, and are judged by ethical standards. Finally, there is a short account of Christianity in Britain, including its history and a description of its present position. It is contended that the gradualness of political change in this country is largely due to the mitigating power exercised by Christianity upon revolutionary passions; and that in our present social distress only the same influence can maintain a moral advance which can cope with the rush of technicological development. ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Theology of Martin Luther. By H. H. KRAMM. Jas. Clarke. 10s. 6d.

Dr. Kramm disclaims any attempt to make his book a complete exposition of Luther's theology. But he has written an Introduction to Luther that will be found helpful by serious students who need a guide to put them on the road that leads to a first-hand acquaintance with Luther's own writings. After a clearly written "background" chapter, which sets the Reformer's work in its historical context and brings out into relief its central theological concerns, Dr. Kramm deals with Luther's doctrine of Man, his doctrine of Salvation, his view of the Church and the Ministry, his Eschatology, his attitude to the Bible, and his teaching on the relation of the Church to the State. The chapters on Church and Ministry, the Bible, and Church and State, embodying the results of Dr. Kramm's own special studies, stand on a more authoritative level than the rest. Here the documentation is much fuller than in the rest of the book, and all students of Luther will profit by Dr. Kramm's work. The remaining chapters are on a much smaller scale, and in them Dr. Kramm has admittedly leaned heavily on other scholars. It would be well to use this book side by side with books like P. S. Watson's *Let God be God* and Edgar Carlson's *The Reinterpretation of Luther*, which take more account than Dr. Kramm does of recent Swedish work on the subject. Not the least useful feature of Dr. Kramm's book is its frequent reference to the beliefs and practices of contemporary Lutheranism. H. F. LOVELL COCKS.

God was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement. By D. M. BAILLIE. Faber & Faber. 16s.

The Incarnation, we should all agree, is a paradox. "The Word Became Flesh" was a message that grated on the ears of philosophically-minded pagans, whose metaphysics ruled out the possibility of such an event. And today it is still a paradox. So unwelcome is it to our human rationality that even Christians tend to turn away from it, either by a virtual denial of our Lord's full humanity—think, for example, of the widespread docetism so strikingly revealed in the protests of some churchgoers against the broadcasting of "The Man born to be King"; or else by a view of Jesus which sees him as a man in whom God is manifested to a degree far greater than in any other, but not as the incarnate Son of God in the sense of the historic creeds. But what are we to say about the nature of this paradox? Does it stand alone, making the dogma of the Incarnation a core of irrationality

at the heart of a religion otherwise reasonable? Or is it the living centre of a Gospel that is paradoxical throughout its range? Professor Baillie's book is noteworthy for his thorough discussion of the place of paradox in the Christian faith and his use of the paradox of grace as the master-key to our understanding of the Incarnation, the Trinity and the Atonement. How can Christ be both God and Man? How can faith and faith's obedience be all of grace and yet the believer's own free choice and act? These two questions, he urges, are one and the same question. And he uses the paradox of grace as an analogy of the paradox of the union of God and Man in Christ. Not—need it be said?—as suggesting that the Incarnation is the supreme instance of the indwelling of divine grace in our common humanity, but rather as insisting that the Incarnation is itself *the* paradox of grace, and the *fons et origo* of that indwelling in you and me. And with the same clue in his hand, Professor Baillie approaches the doctrines of the Trinity and of Atonement. No bald statements of a reviewer can give any adequate idea of the riches of this book. It is without question one of the best books on its subject that have appeared for many years. If criticism must be offered, it may be said that some readers will feel that there may be more justification for the use of the concept of Enhypostasia in the christological context than Professor Baillie allows. One can imagine an extension of his use of the paradox of grace which might illuminate and justify it. And, again, in his section on Kenosis, we miss any reference to P.T. Forsyth's "Person and Place of Jesus Christ"—a book to be reckoned with by critics of kenotic theories. But we cannot be sufficiently grateful when a theologian of Professor Baillie's power and penetration infuses his discussion of these high themes with such a truly evangelical fervour as he has done in this book and writes in a style so limpid and flowing. Here is theology at once luminous and profound. Let every minister, let every student of theology, read this book and be thankful. H. F. Lovell Cocks.

The Freedom of Necessity. By J. D. Bernal, F.R.S. Routledge and Kegan Paul. 18s.

The book is a collection of essays and occasional papers by the author of *The Social Function of Science*. They are grouped under the general titles Man and the World, the Relevance of Science, Science and the Humanities, Science and the Arts, Organization of Science, Science in Economics and Politics, the Atomic Age, and Marxist Studies. Readers of Professor Bernal's earlier volume will be prepared for brilliant and vigorous writing, infused with a passionate belief in the saving mission of science in our modern world. It will do none of us any harm to see how our contemporary situation—and incidentally Christianity—looks to a convinced Marxist, and when we have allowed for inevitable distortion of the perspective there is much to be learned from Professor Bernal as he plays his set of variations on his theme—"the unity of the sciences and the arts, together with their full extension towards social understanding and social needs". And when he says that "the work of the artist, the experience of the mystic or the religious is genuine in so far as it is total experience, not excluding the practical needs and the mental climate of the people for whom they feel and to whom they address their message", we may agree that this is indeed one of the marks of an authentic gospel. It would be easy to protest against Professor Bernal's misunderstandings of Christianity and its rôle in history. But it would be more salutary to remind ourselves how much

truth there is in the Marxist view of religion and to ask how far we Christians are responsible for the estrangement of such scientific integrity and reforming zeal as are manifested in this book. H. F. Lovell Cocks.

Social Biology and Welfare. By Sybil Neville-Rolfe. Allen & Unwin. 21s.

This book tells the story of the fight for a scientific approach to the many sided problem of sex in community life: prostitution, sex education, social hygiene, family relationships, and the relevant legal reforms. The valuable appendix gives legal, statistical and other information on social problems. Thirty years ago the book would have seemed revolutionary: today it seems in part platitudinous, but that is a measure of progress. Not all are converted, as the recent storm in a teacup over sex-education in a Yorkshire school shows. But the fact that an ignorant and prejudiced minority of parents are over ruled by the majority, and had no support from the Education Authority, is reassuring. Unfortunately intellectual enlightenment does not solve sex problems: they are rooted in emotional insecurity and immaturity, so that Social Biology can say a helpful, but not the last, word on the problem. The book could, with advantage, have been smaller and cheaper, tending to be somewhat repetitious. H. J. S. Guntrip.

Your Child and You. By Cecil Hay-Shaw. John Murray. 6s.

This is one of the few books one feels it would be difficult to overpraise. It is in all respects admirable, and worthy to make one of a trinity along with Susan Isaacs' "Nursery Years" and Gwen Chester's "Mothering of Young Children", to be put into the hands of all young parents. It gives the essence of the best child psychology of our day presented in a common sense and eminently readable way. Anyone who reads the first chapter will read to the end. Part I covers normal development from infancy to adolescence; Part II, maladjustment; Part III, the uses of Child Guidance Clinics. H. J. S. Guntrip.

What is Psycho-analysis? By Dr. E. Jones. Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d.

This is an introduction to Freudian theory for those who really want to know the essentials. It could hardly be bettered. The basic hypotheses are stated with admirable simplicity and no ambiguity. The brief indications of the applications of the theory to medicine, education, anthropology, sociology and politics, criminology and law, art, myth, and religion, will tempt the reader to explore further. The author achieves his aim, of which he writes: "so much misapprehension prevails on the subject that he wished to leave the reader in no doubt about what psycho-analysis really is. The reader is naturally not thereby put into a position to pass judgment . . . but at least he had been informed what psycho-analysis is about". No one in Britain has a better right to do this than Dr. E. Jones.

If one may venture a criticism it is one that applies to much Freudian writing. There is a tendency to assume an identity between the facts Freud discovered and his special interpretation of them. Freud was the first ever to recognize certain facts about infantile development in the parent-child relationship, and so created the scientific study of the psycho-genesis of personality. His own explanation of the facts is contained in his theory of infantile component sex instincts and the Oedipus complex. The same

facts, however, are susceptible of radically different interpretation, as in Dr. Fairbairn's revised libido theory, which removes many of the major difficulties which have been felt about Freud. It seems too much like the defence of an orthodoxy to say, as Dr. Jones does on p. 47, "all other conclusions of psycho-analytic theory are grouped round this (Oedipus) complex, and by the truth of this finding psycho-analysis stands or falls".

H. J. S. GUNTRIP.

Edward Burrough: A Wrestler for Truth: 1634-1662. By ELISABETH BROCKBANK. Bannisdale Press. 7s. 6d.

Margaret Fell: Mother of Quakerism. By ISABEL ROSS. Longmans. 21s.

Neither of these books is the first attempt to tell the story of these two champions of early Quakerism; but each is a vast improvement on earlier lives, and the story deserves retelling. Burrough has been called "the Quakers' greatest pamphleteer". His biographer thus had much printed matter on which to draw, written often in controversy over "false damnable doctrines, held forth by Independents and in particular by one John Bunion". But Elisabeth Brockbank did not let the dust of controversy dim the gallantry of this "wrestler for truth", whose "very strength was bended after God", and who "never spent one week to himself" till he died, not yet 30, in Newgate Gaol.

Compared with Burrough's meteoric career, Margaret Fell's light burns steadily and firmly. Fervently welcoming George Fox in 1652, taking him for her second husband in 1669, she lives on into the 18th century, an octogenarian but still so true to her first vision that she laments "this narrowness and strictness entering in" among Friends. Mrs. Ross's sub-title is a subtle one. For not only was Margaret Fell a great lady whose hospitality and familiarity with crowned heads did much to shelter the early Quakers; by the strength of her personality—in imprisonment she was every whit as intrepid as Burrough—she laid firm foundations for equality between men and women in the Society.

Like too many biographies of this type, each of these books is inexact, and each is uncritical: the writers see their subjects hagiographically and with insufficient comparative knowledge of the contemporary religious life outside Quakerism. But both books are based on MS. sources, and Mrs. Ross gives the references. Both writers also provide genuine atmosphere from their love for the countryside of N.W. England, from which their subjects sprang; Mrs. Ross, indeed, lived for some years at Swarthmore Hall, the home of Margaret Fell, and is her lineal descendant.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The Great German Mystics: Eckhart, Tauler and Suso. By JAMES M. CLARK. Blackwell. Oxford. 12s. 6d.

Dr. Clark is a Lecturer in German in the University of Glasgow, and his book is in the series entitled "Modern Language Studies". His approach is thus literary and bibliographical rather than religious and interpretative. With admirable clarity and conciseness he presents the facts concerning these three great Dominicans' lives and writings, so far as they have been securely ascertained, and distinguishes them from the legend and misunderstanding which have arisen, as, for instance, round Rulman Merswin and

has fictitious *Gottesfreund im Oberland.* Denifle's destructive analysis receives full recognition, but Dr. Clark is also appreciative of older, pioneer work such as Karl Schmidt's. Schmidt was a native of Strasbourg, and the importance of the free city as the great centre for these mystics and Friends of God (as later for the early Reformers) is very clear. In a brief introduction Dr. Clark shows how the growth of mysticism was "due to the impact of scholastic philosophy on educated women in nunneries. . . . Many of the finest mystical writings are sermons preached to nuns".

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Citizen Thomas More and His Utopia. By RUSSELL AMES. Princeton University Press. Oxford University Press. 20s.

Mr. Ames here develops the very interesting thesis (not quite original) that the *Utopia* was neither a nostalgic mediaevalism nor an anticipation of modern Socialism, but an acid criticism of the government of the day disguised as a phantasy. No doubt under the Tudors criticism of the State was a dangerous trade just as in the later Middle Ages criticism of the Church was dangerous, and in both cases allegory was a fairly safe way out. More, according to Mr. Ames, represented the views of nearly the whole of the middle class of England—commercial, anti-feudal and professional. He pokes fun at the scholastics as did Erasmus, and like Cervantes he laughs chivalry to scorn. Like Swift he loathes war and all the nonsense of military glory. In other words he is against all the institutions which stand in the way of a good, honest, hard-working middle class community, tolerant of each other's point of view, even in religion, and enjoying themselves in a thoroughly healthy-minded way.

This, of course, has been pointed out before, but in addition to his interpretation of Utopia in the light of Tudor middle class ideals, Mr. Ames looks further afield and sees in the *Utopia* the ideas of Diderot and Jefferson. There are times, indeed, when we wonder whether *Utopia* is not best described as an earlier version of the New Deal! The most interesting part of the book is the way in which he relates the ideas of *Utopia* to More's own political and business career, and also to the events of the time. It is an excellent historical study well documented and well written.

A. V. MURRAY.

Karl Barth: Dogmatics in Outline. S.C.M. 12s. 6d.

These lectures were given at Bonn in 1946 to an audience of students, theological and otherwise. Now rendered into English by G. T. Thomson they are of value not only for the scholar but also for the minister in his pulpit and teaching work.

It is as well to remember that Karl Barth began his theological pilgrimage when he was confronted by the practical problem of preaching in the present age, and therefore it might be expected that the kind of theology he expounds has at least the virtue of being preachable. Whether the reader will also be convinced by it is of course another matter. But here in this not over-long and therefore not unduly expensive book we have a phrase by phrase, and in part a word by word, commentary on the Apostles Creed, and thereby the mind of this distinguished theologian on the traditional fundamentals of the Christian Faith.

Of particular interest to Congregationalists is the lecture from which we can learn Barth's views on the nature, government and work of the Church.

He states emphatically his agreement with Luther in preferring the word "congregation" to the word "Church". "Ekklesia" meant a coming together in answer to a summons, and that is what has happened to Christians; they have been caused to congregate together by God; this is not something in which the initiative was taken by them.

We must beware, Barth tells us, of asserting any belief in the Church which is not grounded on belief in the Holy Spirit, for it is the work of the Holy Spirit which constitutes the Church. Our faith in the Church is that in this visible congregation of ordinary men and women, not lacking in spots and wrinkles, the Holy Spirit is at work. In that way also we come to discern the unity that underlies the variations in Christian congregations and that goes deeper than denominational differences. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst" is the great promise. In that promise we are assured that despite the differences we are all in some way united in Him.

But if any Congregationalist expects to find Karl Barth explicitly commending the Congregational form of Church government, he will be disappointed. What Barth does stress is that in the Church Christ and Christ alone must rule the congregation. Neither monarchical nor democratic government in the Church is in itself right. Any form of rule by men can be justified only so far as by it the will of Christ is done. So that Christ may indeed rule it is essential that in the Church a large place should be given to the exposition and application of the Scriptures which witness to Him.

The prime work of the Church is to preach the Gospel. As Barth indicates elsewhere in this book, he thinks of the Church as brought into being for that very purpose. The interim time between Christ's earthly existence and His return in glory is prolonged by the patience of God so that there may be a proclamation of the Gospel to every creature, and men may hear, believe and repent. Strong words are used to condemn the Church which has turned in upon itself and forgotten or neglected its "worldly" task of making the Gospel known to all. Such a Church "smacks of death", "anyone with a keen nose will smell it and find it dreadful". Services, sermons, sacraments and theologies may have their place, but "the one thing needful" is to proclaim the Gospel "Christ is the Lord". The Church is apostolic, "sent out".

We cannot but be struck by the forward-looking nature of the Church as Barth pictures it in this book. Whether it be in terms of the Coming of the Lord or of the Kingdom of God or the expectation of the Resurrection of the Body the note of expectant hope is struck again and again. This is certainly something often lacking in the modern Church, but which is a vital matter. To use Barth's own words when he is speaking of the hope of the men of the world, "We Christians have to put the right Alpha and Omega into the heart of this secular thought and hope". But one is left wondering whether that can be done by using some of these old phrases with associations incredible to most modern ears. Even as we follow Barth's own interpretations of such phrases we are not always sure how much is meant to be metaphor and how much literal truth. E. W. NICHOLAS.

* * *

Charles Freer Andrews. A Narrative by Benarsidas Chaturvedi and Marjorie Sykes. Allen & Unwin. 18s. cloth, 10s. 6d. paper.

We have found this book of quite unusual interest. C. F. Andrews was known as "the best-loved Englishman in India" and, wherever he went, he won affection and friendship. He had a radiancy and graciousness which made him to many the nearest embodiment they had seen of that love which I Corinthians XIII describes. Knowing him, it was easier to understand the fascination St. Francis of Assisi had for his contemporaries. His was a sublime simplicity and even his little foibles, his untidiness and forgetfulness, only added to his charm. I well remember meeting him for the first time when he came at my request to Cheshunt College, and later he spoke in the Common Room at New College and was our guest overnight. He was with us at a time of critical importance. Mr. Gandhi had fasted almost to death in order to prevent the outcasts having the separate franchise given them by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald's Communal Award and C. F. Andrews showed me a letter he had received from Rabindranath Tagore written at Gandhi's bedside. To threaten to fast to death unless a particular policy was adopted, is a method of coercion which it is hard to approve. But how much it meant that one Englishman had the trust and friendship of Tagore and Gandhi, and was able to act as the interpreter of the East to the West.

The main features of C. F. Andrews' life will be familiar to most readers of the Quarterly. His father was an ardent Irvingite, and had destined his son to the ministry of the Catholic Apostolic Church. At Cambridge, where Andrews gained a brilliant First Class in the Classical Tripos, his views changed. He was at first influenced by the C.I.C.C.U. and admired its fervour and evangelistic zeal. But he broke away from it, as he could not belive in the doctrine of eternal torment. His views on Biblical inspiration changed, and, within a year of coming to Cambridge, he found he could not be a minister of the Church of his upbringing. Westcott and Gore helped him to face his difficulties; he became an Anglican and, after working in the slums, returned to Cambridge as Vice-Principal of Westcott House. When thirty-three years old, he went to St. Stephen's College, Delhi, and henceforth his life was identified with India's needs and aspirations and, wherever Indians were oppressed, whether in South Africa, Kenya or Fiji, Andrews was there, championing their cause.

This book, though delightful to read, is based on a very careful study of documents and throws new light upon Andrews' influence and character. It is long since we have read so fascinating a biography. Sydney Cave.

The Call. By C. E. Norwood. Independent Press. 6s.

This book deals with a matter which has been a source of deep and growing concern for more than a generation, that of ministerial settlements and removals. It does not, as might at first be suspected from the title, deal with "the call" to the ministry, but only more narrowly with "the call" to a pastorate, and that from the point of view of minister and Church. It does not deal with the method of discerning that call employed by other Churches, but solely with that in force among Congregationalists.

While he is rightly critical of much that is done among us, Mr. Norwood fearlessly upholds our true practice. He believes that our present troubles can be traced to one root. "Our real problem is that we have lost our fathers' lively belief in a God who thinks ahead for our good, and asks of us that we really do try to discover His will" (p. 27). There is a very timely reminder of the means we employ for discovering that will. "We

would emphasize that the Church Meeting is not an assembly for discovering the will of the majority. On the contrary it is an instrument for discerning the will of God" (p. 35). "It is an august responsibility which devolves upon our Churches. . . . They are sharing in the purpose of God, and how can they do it unless they pray?" (p. 46). The next duty of the Church is to find out all it can about any man whose name is before it, and to be plain and frank in all its negotiations with him. There are as many wise words for ministers as there are for Churches, and many shrewd and some sharp things are said by the way, e.g. about salaries or ministerial secretaries.

Some will find themselves differing from Mr. Norwood on one main point, which is neatly focussed by the title of his last chapter, "New Machinery or Deeper Faith?" Mr. Norwood answers his question without hesitation. "We would not advocate another attempt to construct machinery for dealing with the problem; we suggest that the true remedy is to be found at a deeper level". Here is a very dangerous antithesis. We need a new spirit, a richer and more Christian spirit, and this book will be wonderfully used in promoting it. But that is not to say that this spirit does not need more adequate channels of expression. It is possible in this matter to be as foolishly simple as the folk who believe that if we were all Christians our social and international problems would vanish. A Christian spirit calls for the most efficient methods of working. The Report of the Union Committee on Settlements and Removals issued in 1938 may deserve some of Mr. Norwood's strictures, but it was justified in saying, "It must be frankly realized that method is important, and that spiritual power may be impeded in its action and diminished in its effect if the channels through which it has to flow are ill-devized, narrow or tortuous".

The most delightful thing about the whole book is the spirit in which it is written, modest, kind and believing. J. WILDING.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

The twenty-one sermons in the Rev. Leslie Cooke's *Faith Stakes a Claim* (Independent Press, 6s.) all have individuality and are good examples of modern preaching. They are perceptive of the needs and challenge of the passing hour, and have a firm hold on the things which abide and can avail. In many ways they are what Dr. Forsyth meant by "positive preaching"; the work of a man who has something definite to say, and is not floundering. Mr. Cooke has also a sense for words, and this gives his sermons a certain freshness and purity of style; a very welcome freedom from pulpit dialect. The sermons are not all of equal value; but the best of them are very good indeed.

Mr. Jack Lawson's *Peter Lee* (Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.) will give pleasure far beyond the circle of those who knew at first-hand Lee's work for the Durham miners. It is the story of a life spent unceasingly for the welfare of the mining community, and of unusual gifts devoted daily to the service of his fellow-workers. This service was the passion of his life. Reading this book I was reminded of hearing Keir Hardie how many years ago in the Free Trade Hall at Manchester: there was in Lee much of the spirit of Keir Hardie and others of a like strain. His social work was in its way a Gospel to him. Peter Lee was a Methodist lay preacher; and to the end there was a firm faith and a religious background in his work. What he said in the pulpit he said on the platform and in all he did. Mr. Lawson has told the story well. The Prime Minister contributes a foreword to the book.

Dr. Paul Tillich's sermons in his volume *The Shaking of the Foundations* (S.C.M., 10s. 6d.) are a confession of faith, and a criticism of the too common attitude of men to the world and to life. Dr. Tillich taught in several German universities before having to leave Germany on the rise of Hitler: he is now a Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. A certain strain can be felt in these sermons arising out of his bitter experiences; and there is also an element in them a little foreign to English readers. But they have power and a hold on spiritual realities. They will help many who are bewildered in mind, and perhaps chiefly the university student. The two sermons, "The Yoke of Religion", and "He Who is the Christ" contain the pith of the book; and its mysticism is summed up in the sentence, "On the boundaries of the finite, the infinite becomes visible".

The Rev. J. Cyril Downes gives us a phrase by phrase exposition of the Apostles' Creed in his *The Facts of Faith* (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.). The book is based on lectures given to prospective lay preachers and candidates for the Methodist ministry serving in Italy during 1944-45. It has several woodcut illustrations by the Italian painter, Professor Paschetto. The chapters are well annotated, and there are directions for wider study.

Dr. Kenneth Crosby's *The Lord Jesus Christ* (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.) is a book on Christian doctrine primarily for use in the African mission field. It will be found useful as a brief introduction to the theology of the Person of Christ. This central Christian doctrine is dealt with in its implications for Christian character.

Two books on the devotional life are the Rev. G. Parrinder's *Learning to Pray* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.) and Fr. W. Stephenson's *Christ our Light*

(Browns & Nolan, 8s. 6d.). The first is a Methodist manual for young people; it is simple in outline and well adapted for its purpose. The second is of a more advanced type. From their different points of view both books contain much that is valuable for the life of prayer.

The Rev. J. A. Ramsbotham's *Belief in Christ and the Christian Community* (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.) contains six addresses delivered in St. George's, Jesmond, in connection with the "Parish Communion Movement". The Bishop of Newcastle writes a brief introduction. A. T. S. James.

Dr. Albert Schweitzer's *Goethe* (A. & C. Black, 6s.) comprises his address on receiving the Goethe Prize at Frankfort in 1928, a lecture on Goethe's message for our time delivered, also at Frankfurt, in 1932, and an article (now translated for the first time) on Goethe the Thinker, originally written for the French review *Europe*. This little book, like every book in which one great and many-sided man writes of another, has a double interest. It is valuable as much for what it reveals of its author as for what it tells of its subject. Most books about Goethe are concerned with the poet, and ignore or belittle his practical and scientific achievements. Himself philosopher, musician, doctor of medicine and practical philanthropist, Dr. Schweitzer is qualified, as few men can be, to see him steadily and see him whole.

During a long life devoted to the service of education in England and India, Sir Philip Hartog (1864-1947) helped to shape the University of London in the crucial formative years at the beginning of the century, played a leading part in the establishment of the School of Oriental and African Studies in London, and was the first Vice-Chancellor and virtual creator of the University of Dacca in Bengal. But great as was his work as an administrator, he is perhaps more generally known as a constructive critic of the examination system and as a lifelong advocate for the better teaching of English in schools. In *Philip Hartog: A Memoir* (Constable, 10s.) his wife Mabel Hartog writes pleasantly, and not entirely uncritically, of a man of many interests and considerable achievement.

Mr. John Gunther's *Death be not Proud* (Hamish Hamilton, 7s. 6d.) is a memoir of the author's only son, who died in 1947, aged 17, after a series of operations for tumour of the brain. In the hands of a writer less practised and less virile, so personal a document containing so much clinical detail might have been embarrassing. Mr. Gunther makes the truth as dramatic as any fiction. But whether such a direct assault on the emotions is "fair", is a question which every reader must answer for himself.

El Greco (Dolphin Book Co., 2s. 6d.) consists of 12 pages of notes by Mrs. Natalia Cossio de Jiminez on the painter's birthplace, education and family. Except perhaps to the specialist, the purpose of this pamphlet is not obvious, and the argument is sometimes difficult to follow; but the two illustrations and the note on Byzantine influence in El Greco's pictures are interesting.

In 1764 was published John Newton's *Authentic Narrative*, an account of the author's involuntary conversion to Christianity during an adventurous and all but fatal voyage from Africa to Ireland. In *The Ancient Mariner and the Authentic Narrative* (Heinemann, 7s. 6d.) Mr. Bernard Martin suggests that Coleridge, when writing his poem, had this story, consciously or sub-consciously, in mind. The parallel between the poem and the narrative is in fact so close that it can be expressed in tabular form, and the evidence adduced by Mr. Martin to support his hypothesis is so complete that it would surely have convinced Coleridge himself. In addition to the

argument the book contains the original text of *The Ancient Mariner* and relevant extracts from the *Authentic Narrative*.

Katherine Mansfield and Other Literary Portraits (Peter Nevill, 12s. 6d.) contains 15 critical essays by Mr. John Middleton Murry. As one of the older and fast-diminishing school of critics who approach literature without political prejudice, Mr. Murry has something worth while to say even on so familiar a topic as the "Ode to a Nightingale". There is a delightfully characteristic portrait of Hardy, the most modest of all great writers, and a valuable essay on Andrew Bradley, whose *Shakespearean Tragedy* is claimed as "the greatest single work of criticism in the English language".

Barbara Charlton, *née* Tasburgh, was born in 1815 and died, after a full and interesting life, in 1898. Her autobiography, which she did not live to complete, has now been edited by her grandson, Air-Commodore L. E. O. Charlton. *Recollections of a Northumbrian Lady*, 1815-1866 (Cape, 15s.) is a valuable addition to English social history, giving, as it does, a detailed picture of the almost self-contained life of the old North of England Roman Catholic families before Emancipation. But most of the allusions to famous names, including George Sand, Queen Victoria and Cardinal Wiseman, are tantalizingly slight. Wordsworth is described as "the verbose and cantankerous poet", and Swinburne as a "pretty-featured carroty-haired, spoilt boy". P. A. SPALDING.

Introduction to Scripture Teaching. J. W. D. Smith. (Nelson, 6s.). It is good to have a book on this subject by one who is both a convinced Christian and an educational expert. For too long, as the first section of this book admirably traces, religious education was undertaken as instruction without being related to the experience of the child. In his concluding section Mr. Smith shows how it may be so related, while in his middle section he deals with the problem of the nature of the authority of the Bible, and of its message. The book is only an introduction, as its title suggests, and one could wish that Mr. Smith had expanded his third section, and indicated where the student might follow up the second section by further reading. None the less it will serve as a valuable introduction to many students and young teachers, and we shall await with interest the further books on Scripture teaching which he promises.

The School Service, compiled by Philip Wayne (Methuen, 3s. 6d.) contains services designed for use in Grammar schools, together with additional prayers and readings, and a collection of hymns. Most noteworthy are the extra-Biblical passages, one of which usually follows a Bible passage. These are apt and of high quality, but one regrets that they include so few examples from modern writers. The compiler has aimed at giving material suitable for Sixth Form comprehension and those who agree with him that this does no disservice to the younger children, will find this book useful, as also may those responsible for services in Training Colleges.

From the Lutterworth Press come two little devotional commentaries intended for Africans, one on *Saint John's Gospel* and one on *The Acts of the Apostles* (1s. each). They are simple, and intensely practical, and, particularly in the case of the commentary on Saint John's Gospel, which contains fewer specific references to African life than the other, are eminently suitable to put in the hands of our own young people and newly-accepted Church members.

An Anthology of Prayers for Schools, by H. Hartley (Macdonald, 6s.). A novel feature of this book is a section containing prayers written by children, and this will probably in itself recommend the book to Heads of

Secondary schools. For the rest, most of the prayers that they will expect are here, together with some less familiar ones; but some may feel that in his justifiable concern to present children with prayers hallowed by tradition and made beautiful by their language, the compiler has not always realized his own aim of ensuring that their meaning also is intelligible to children. Not the least valuable part of the book is the compiler's preface, and his annotations of his sources.

The Religious Education Press, Ltd. (85 Manor Road, Wallington, Surrey) has just published two more volumes in their *Bible Lesson Handbook* series—the second year course for Primary and Junior grades, at 6s. each. These volumes contain lesson notes based on the All-Bible Course of the British Lessons Council and will undoubtedly prove a help to Sunday School teachers who follow this course. From the same press comes *Heroes of The Way,* Junior Lessons, vol. IV, price 5s., in the well-known *Teachers' Guides* series. This volume contains some useful outlines of the lives of saints and four lessons based on missionary work in modern China, as well as Biblical material. It is of the same high standard as the rest of the series, and will be welcome to many teachers for its non-Biblical material alone.

A. E. BRADFIELD.

The Great Unity, by Margaret Barr, M.A. (Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d.)
Shall We Follow Karl Barth? by Sidney Spencer, B.A. (Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d.)
The Meaning and Value of Religion, by Sidney Spencer, B.A.
(Lindsey Press, 1s.)
Is There a Religious Basis for Society? by Sidney Spencer, B.A.
(Lindsey Press, 1s.)

All these books appear to be reprints, but though their content sometimes dates them they are still relevant. All are written from the Unitarian standpoint.

Margaret Barr's book is an introduction to Comparative Religion adapted for children. The author believes that this way of teaching religion should be adopted generally and not only in such non-sectarian Indian schools as that for which this course was devised. The emphasis is naturally on the points of agreement in the great religions and not on their differences. If Jesus was indeed only "one of the prophets" this book is well done.

"Shall We Follow Karl Barth?" can be recommended as giving a fair and useful outline of the chief distinctive features of the theology of Karl Barth. The criticisms the author makes are also well directed, but he is not unaware there was some ground for the Barthian reaction.

Sidney Spencer finds "The Meaning and Value of Religion" in its unifying power and which arises from the sense of the sacred in which religion has its origin. The great mystics represent the highest fruit of religion for they have attained to a life at one with the Spirit of the universe. They foreshadow "a new and unified humanity, a state of being in which we are no longer discordant units, but conscious parts of a greater life".

It is not difficult to see how such an interpretation of religion can be used to answer the question "Is There a Religious Basis for Society?" which is the title of Mr. Spencer's other book. He sees the only hope for the future in the growth of such a religious consciousness, wherein a sense of spiritual solidarity will be coupled with a reverence for life in its individual manifestations.

E. W. NICHOLAS.

Does Belief Matter? by R. H. Hobday (S.P.C.K., 1s.). To attempt to include in 30 pages reflections upon primitive religion, arguments for the existence of God, consideration of Divine Omnipotence, an exposition of the

boons of life, thoughts on modern science, materialism and Communism, as well as the subject indicated by the title, is indeed to essay a difficult task. There is much good material here, in fact far too much to make a readable booklet. We wish the author had dealt only with the subject "Does Belief Matter?" but this in fact has little space devoted to it. Those who like their thinking in tabloid form may appreciate this production, but we fear even they will be hungry by the end for one good square meal.

E. W. Nicholas.

Preaching and the Dramatic Arts by E. Winston Jones (Macmillan, New York, 7s. 6d.) fills a conspicuous gap in homiletic literature. It is argued that the vital function of preaching is only fulfilled when it partakes of the nature of drama. It is far from the author's intention to make actors of preachers, however. His concern is that the sermon should fulfil its proper function of influencing the will, and that the pulpit should once again exert its influence in personal and social life. Dr. Jones never merely theorizes, but stands always with the preacher before his congregation, showing how attention is arrested and maintained, and giving many helpful suggestions with regard to the use of story material and the value of poetry.

Jason S. Wright.

Religion Through Drama (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.), edited by Mr. Michael Sims-Williams, is not a book on play production, but a textbook of an educational method. Religion through Drama is a group activity and its aim is "primarily to help students to enter into the feelings and thoughts of the characters they study. The method uses what may be described as a biographical approach to ideas". The theme of a dramatic project is chosen, the leader outlines the plot and gives the material facts, but the actors themselves must discover the necessary details regarding the character they are to represent by group discussion or individual research.

"R.T.D." is closely allied to Community Drama which is being carried on at Community House, Glasgow. The main difference is that "R.T.D." employs extempore dialogue and it is not intended that any course should be "written-up" as a play.

The major part of the book is devoted to very comprehensive notes on five "R.T.D." Courses, and this does not make interesting reading. The notes and commentaries on the courses are too much like "spoon-feeding" to be regarded as a really sound educational method. Jason S. Wright.

The Rev. F. H. Brabant has given us a most refreshing book in *Neville Stuart Talbot* (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.). Of gigantic stature, Talbot had a heart and interests to match his frame. A combatant in the Boer War, a student and then a don at Oxford, a chaplain in the Great War, a bishop in Pretoria—so varied was the stage upon which his abundant life was poured forth. Here was a bishop, son of a bishop, who could turn and look at the Anglican Church and say, "The conviction that sticks and won't let me alone is that the Church of England, as such, as a whole, is in great peril for lack of corporate risk-taking, decision and sacrifice". Here was an Anglo-Catholic who could say, "I shall die declaring that the Free Churches possess an aspect of the Truth which we need". Here was a fearless Christian leader to proclaim of a Colour Bar Bill, "I believe and say it is wrong definitely by legislation to prevent whatever development human beings are capable of". To draw a fair portrait of so outspoken and unconventional a person cannot have been easy. But Mr. Brabant has done his work modestly and well. He need not have been so apologetic about the "invincible boyishness", "irrepressible nature" or "outrageous sallies" of his subject. A Church

which makes Mr. Greatheart a bishop is as likely to gain our admiring affection as one which only puts safe men in office.

The Book Supreme by Dr. Joe Brice (Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.) can be unreservedly recommended to ministers, teachers and all serious students of the Bible. Taking the books in groups, Dr. Brice gives the historical background, a synopsis of each book and a list of the key passages in it. What he writes can be accepted as the assured results of conservative "criticism". With its help each book can be placed in its proper setting. It should be noted that we are given results. There is a statement rather than a discussion. Of course, some of the statements are disputable. For example, a late date for Ezra (397 B.C.) is accepted without reserve; Trito-Isaiah is assumed to be one prophet; Mark 13 is a "discourse" by Jesus to the disciples; the Johannine Epistles are evidently by the hand that wrote the Fourth Gospel; and the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals is accepted. It will be seen that if the book errs at all, it is on the side of conservatism, a venial fault.

The book deserves to go through several editions, and one or two slips are due for correction: p. viii, an inverted apostrophe; 74, a missing "1"; 118, (273-10) should read (27^{3-10}); 142, "troubled extracts" should read "travel extracts"; 165 "aline" should be "align"; 180 "Jewist" should be "Jewish".

The book is furnished with ten very useful maps, seven of which unfortunately carry mis-spellings, viz, 1 (Thopsacus), 2 (Chinncreth, Kadesh Barmea), 6 (Ptolemars), 7 (Judea, text always Judaea), 8 (Cappodocia, Judea), 9 (Beroca), 10 (Cappodocia, Solomis).

The type, layout and binding of the book are most attractive.

Is it still believed in the backwoods of Nonconformity that Catholics are not permitted to read the Bible? Here is part of the evidence to the contrary. The volume before us is No. 2 of a series of six Scripture Textbooks for Catholic Schools. *Old Testament Stories* by Dom Hubert van Zeller (Burns Oates, 6s. 6d.) is for children 12-13 years old. "It is our fervent hope," writes Cardinal Griffin in his foreword, "that through the study of these books the children will be encouraged to read the Scriptures for themselves". What we have is the main "story" of the Old Testament told as a continuous narrative. The writer is master of a sprightly style, admirably suited to the story of Samson (p. 94) but lamentable when used of Elijah on Carmel (p. 159). The Biblical stories are accepted as they stand, Adam and Eve are historical persons, the age of the Patriarchs is stressed, and Joshua's long day is literal fact. While reference is made to Archaeology, no use is made of Higher Criticism. Only in the closing chapter is the moral standard of the Old Testament reviewed in the light of that of the New. But by then the child has learned of a God who blotted out Sodom (p. 23) and who commanded massacre (p. 112). Perhaps it would be better that Catholics should not be encouraged to read the Bible, at least, not in this way.

One does not lightly recommend ministers to pay 5s. (paper) or 7s. 6d. (cloth) for a book of less than 100 pages. But all who are concerned about the future of man on this planet will do well to buy and ponder *The Clash of Loyalties* by Prof. Edmond Privat (Allen & Unwin). In terse and epigrammatic style, enlivened by a sly humour, we are given a devastating analysis of the peril created by class and national consciousness. Prof. Privat pleads for a "common roof over national ceilings", "a large society . . . an extended ethic". He believes that the future lies with a religion

of the spirit, personal, pacifist, rooted in that "something of God in every man", whose official language shall be *deeds*. This apologia for Quakerism will please some and stir and challenge more.

Making Sense of the Universe by A. Price Hughes (Epworth Press, 6s.) is an ambitious title for a 127-page book which the dust jacket naïvely confesses to consist of "odds and ends". It is a collection of articles and addresses on diverse topics, some of which have ceased to be topical. There are a number of misprints (p. 20, 40, 54, 86) and two misquotations (p. 22, 124). A famous incident in the life of Shackleton is attributed to Scott.

JOHN WILDING.

The Rev. J. W. Woolgar, Rector of Cherry Burton in East Yorkshire, has called *This Sacramental Universe* (James Clarke, 12s. 6d.) an interpretation of the Twentieth Century. It certainly is an *omnium gatherum*. The non-Christian will not find anything that makes contact with him, but the Christian reader will find in this mixture much true and profound Christian wisdom. But the book is too undisciplined to be valuable.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

The Essentials of Indian Philosophy, by M. Hiriyanna (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.), covers much the same ground as the writer's *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*, which was reviewed in these columns on its publication seventeen years ago. Since it is designed for a wider public, it is only about half as long as the earlier book, and is provided, as that was not, with a glossary of Sanskrit terms for which many English readers will be grateful. Concise, lucid and objective, this is an admirable introduction to the study of Indian thought.

S. CAVE.

Change of Life in Women, by Medica (Delisle, 5s.). This small book is an attempt to save women the exaggerated fears and apprehension with which many of them approach the change of life. The physiological and psychological changes which occur at that time are explained in terms which all can understand, and for the more scientifically minded there is a brief but competent discussion of some medical aspects of the problem. It should be very helpful to women and their husbands, and to ministers and others trying to help them through a difficult period in their lives. E. WELFORD.

The Craft of Sermon Construction, by W. E. Sangster (Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.). It is stimulating to read what a successful preacher (though "success" is not a preacher's word) has to tell about the way he does it. Dr. Sangster has here done this to good effect. His book is humbling for ministers, as every book on preaching should be. There are three chapters on the classification of sermons—according to subject-matter, structural type and psychological method. The analysis is perhaps rather overdone and becomes wearisome. Two chapters follow on the beginning and the ending of the sermon—full of sound advice and suggestion. The last chapter on "Mistakes commonly made" hits hard, but tenderly. But nothing in the book is better than the first chapter of all—a Plea for Preaching. Preaching —Dr. Sangster adopts Bernard Manning's definition, "a manifestation of the Incarnate Word, from the Written Word, by the spoken word"—remains ever God's chief way of announcing His will to the world. Related occupations, such as academic research, the psychological clinic, youth work, community centres, marriage guidance, and so on, must never be allowed to push it from its primary place. Books, newspapers, radio can never be a substitute for it. "A personal God, seeking the love and fellowship of persons, seeks best by a person speaking direct to persons". The book abounds in pointed epigram and illustration. It is itself an example of good preaching—to preachers.

William Temple, by Anthony Otter (S.C.M., 1s.). A fascinating, short study of the great Archbishop by one of his old pupils at Repton. Those who have read Iremonger's biography will be the better prepared to enjoy it and will find in it much that is fresh. For those who have not read the longer book this is an appetizing introduction. "Gentlemen do not throw eggs", Temple's only disciplinary comment on the misbehaviour of Repton boys at election-time, is characteristic and memorable. Incidentally, the book has a splendid little description of Student "Swanwick", with a sparkling vignette of our martyr-missionary, Alfred Sadd.

Sermons by Monsignor Ronald Knox, selected and edited by Evelyn Waugh (The Dropmore Press, 42s.). Here are eleven short sermons, luxuriously printed on hand-made paper, in a volume too costly for most of us to buy. Those who are able to read it will be well rewarded. The sermons were delivered on special occasions: some are commemorative—of Edward the Confessor, Abbot Matthews of Ampleforth, Cardinal Newman, Father Faber; one celebrates the coronation of our King, one the dedication of a war memorial, one the jubilee of Campion Hall, the Jesuit house of studies in Oxford, another the opening of a temporary chapel in Oxford; one was given for a meeting of the British Association, and one is a marriage address. They are addressed to Roman Catholics, but in every one of them Mgr. Knox penetrates with profound simplicity into the heart of religion, on ground where Protestants must be at one with him. They present Christian faith and Christian morals in their inseparable embrace. In especial the panegyric of Abbot Matthews, with its quite wonderful description of the ideal schoolmaster, and the address to the British Association, concerning the evangelical care for the individual, complementary to the work of science which must label and generalize, are memorably moving. In their concise beauty of diction these sermons are unsurpassable, and are free from the studied archaism which often make Catholic discourses difficult to profit by. It is to be hoped they will be published in a cheaper form.

H. C. Carter.

Politics and Persons, by Father St. John B. Groser (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.), deserves careful reading, especially by those whose politics are not of the Left. Father Groser went as an Anglican priest to Poplar in 1922, and became a Socialist not through reading books but by living among East End people. His whole thesis is that the worker must be treated as a person, and he condemns the legislation and public administration of the years between 1926 and 1939 because it did not do this. Conservative Governments failed here, and so would a Communist, for Communism thinks in terms of programmes rather than of persons.

There is moving writing in this book, especially in the chapter on People of the East End. Groser does not descend to the merely anecdotal, and his pleading is never hysterical. He gives a good analysis of Marxist claims, and probably knows more Communists personally than most anti-Communist writers. He has no doubt that a Christian cannot be a Communist. The total effect of this book is to lay on the Christian conscience that what Amos said to his generation still needs arguing among Christians today.

Communism, Capitalism and Christianity, by Emil Brunner (Lutterworth Press, 1s. 6d.). In this the Lutterworth Press have made available in brief compass the judgement of one of the most outstanding theologians of our time on an issue of urgent relevance. Brunner is as clear as Father Groser that Communism can make no room in its fold for Christians; he is emphatic that Christians must denounce Communism as they would resist the devil.

He admits that "its diagnosis is broadly correct, but its therapeutics are false" (p. 15). His own position would seem to be that of Socialism revised in the direction of left-wing liberalism, and he urges Christian Socialists who have been impressed by the achievements of Russian communism to revise their opinion in view of its increasingly apparent totalitarianism. Vis-à-vis the other antagonist, Capitalism, Brunner proceeds with less vigour. To *laissez faire* liberalism he would deal the death blow; but there is a type of capitalism to which he would show mercy. Had he lived for twenty years in the slums he might have reserved his heaviest fire, as Groser did, for this opponent. The book includes Brunner's address at the Amsterdam Conference: The Christian Witness to the Order of Society and National Life. The translation has been ably done by the Rev. N. P. Goldhawk. There are misprints on pp. 14, 30, 41.

On the same theme we have John C. Bennett's *Christianity and Communism* (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.), a book of balanced judgment and lucid style. Its conclusions agree in the main with those of Dr. Brunner but are more persuasively argued, and the negative verdict on Communism is the more notable because it recognizes that the appeal of Communism is partly due to the failure of Christianity in its social effects. "Communism, as is often the case with heresy, is a response to a certain onesidedness in the development of the Christianity of the Churches; and it is a corrective that all Christians must take seriously" (p. 47). Bennett goes so far as to say that "Christianity has no stake in the survival of capitalism". What is needed now is not so much expositions of Communism and of Christian criticism of it, but guidance on how Christians can effectively witness to Communists. Bennett realizes this: "The first responsibility of the Christian community is not to save any institutions from Communism, but to present its faith by word and life to the people of all conditions and all lands that they may find for themselves the essential truth about life" (p. 128).

Lost Illusion, by Freda Utley (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.). Miss Utley shared the enthusiasm of many Socialists over the Russian Revolution of 1917, and later became a member of the British Communist Party and went to Russia to see at first hand how the experiment was working out. This book is the story of her revulsion at the tyranny and crudity of the Stalinite régime. She would describe it in a sentence as, economically, State capitalism and, politically, tyranny. Her description refers mainly to the years 1930-1936, when she was actually resident there, having married a Russian. It is markedly sincere and not overdrawn through her disillusionment; but the reader is left wondering whether more sympathetic accounts of the Soviet system such as that of the Webbs are so radically misinformed as Miss Utley implies. Why, moreover, if the régime is so inefficient and the ordinary worker so oppressed did Russia survive the war with Germany?

Years of Wrath (Gollancz, 25s.) is a collection of 317 cartoons by Low, each with a brief descriptive note, spanning the years 1932-1945. The drawings are never merely comic, for Low has a great power of discerning the real issue underlying passing events. To look through these cartoons is a sombre experience, not a bedtime entertainment. Outstanding are the ones on the failure of the Disarmament Conference (May 1934), the one on the lateness of plans for peace (September 1944), and the one rebuking blimpish indignation over the concentration camp horrors (April 1945). There is some of the quality of the Hebrew Prophets here, as the title aptly suggests.

E. C. B.

> Viewing the situation as a whole, we see our society relieved, in large degree, from the heavy pressure of urgent material needs. . . . The actual amount of leisure already available has been expanded quite suddenly of late. . . . It is the individual, his ideas, his tastes, that matter most. . . . The spending of his own leisure should depend upon the choice, the action of the individual himself. The State may encourage and enable; it must not impose. Public opinion may suggest, persuade, lead; it must not drive. A regulated leisure is a contradiction in terms.

These words are taken from the 1948 National Book League Lecture, *Leisure in a Democracy* (C.U.P., 2s.), by Viscount Samuel. The lecturer's political experience and the lecture's occasion made it natural for him to concentrate on "State activity in the cultural field" and to think largely in terms of books. For Londoners this summer there have been unusual attractions in the world of pictures. Those who could not see the Exhibitions may be glad to know that No. 10 of *Art et Style* (Robert Lang, 14 Rue Marignan, Paris, 450 fr.) is devoted to the masterpieces from the Alte Pinakothek at Munich, which have been on show at the National Gallery. The reproductions, many of them in colour, are large enough to study; M. Phillippe Erlanger writes a brief introduction. To pass from the Exhibition into one of the normal rooms of the Gallery was to realize afresh the magnificence of its own collection. A recent Gallery publication is *A Life of Christ from Pictures in the National Gallery* (12s. 6d.). In this the relevant verses in the *A.V.* are printed facing each picture. The pictures exhibited this summer at the Academy can also be studied at a distance through *The Royal Academy Illustrated: 1949* (Clowes, 5s.). For a Pelican to be reprinted in a more permanent form is always a recommendation, and the timely reappearance of Mr. Eric Newton's *Introduction to European Painting* (Longmans, 8s. 6d.) is most welcome. More than 50 illustrations add to the value of a book written in a manner which all can understand, and with pithy contrasts such as "If Rubens could not soar, el Greco's feet never touch earth. If Rubens's world is earthly, el Greco's is made out of a mixture of ice and flame. Rubens's Madonnas and nymphs are Flemish housewives, Greco's have never even heard of a frying-pan". Of Rembrandt Mr. Newton says that "by every known test he is the giant not only of Dutch painting, but of European painting. But . . . I have never been able to love him". A recent sympathetic study is *Rembrandt* (Berlin: Safari-Verlag, DM.25), by Prof. Richard Hamann of Marburg, with nearly 300 illustrations, and a comprehensive index. The writer divides Rembrandt's work into three periods, characterized by the "Lesson in Anatomy" of 1632, the "Night Watch" of 1642 and the "Syndics of the Cloth Hall" of 1662 respectively. The concentrated attention of a concentric group gives place to a group in deliberate disarray, in which each surveys whatever interests him; and this in turn to a group whose harmony is an inner harmony, as one and all look inward on the things of the soul. Prof. Hamann shows Rembrandt as the student and portrayer of all that is most human, and most movingly human, in human nature. "While for Rubens as a Catholic holiness consisted in the deifying of human nature and became visible in the beauty of the body and in its noble bearing, as in the ancient world, for Protestantism (as represented by Rembrandt) the meaning of Christianity consists in God's becoming man and manifests itself in the power of man as created to move to pity". The work of another art critic, Dr. Wilhelm Fraenger, *Hieronymus Bosch: Das Tausendjährige Reich: Grundzüge einer Auslegung* (Coburg: Winkler-Verlag, DM.22), throws light on the beliefs of medieval heresy. A triptych in the Prado at Madrid, showing Paradise on earth, between the Garden of

Eden and Hell, a complicated painting which has long been the subject of puzzled inquiry, is to be understood, the author argues, from the beliefs of the Brethren of the Free Spirit, particularly as these appear in the trial by the Inquisition in 1411 of Willem van Hildernissen, the head of the Brethren at Brussels. The sexual irregularities of which they were accused were not, Dr. Fraenger submits, shameless orgies; they were a restrained attempt to put into practice their conviction that, for the Christian, sexual intercourse is freed from shame, and that in it, as the symbol of divine creativity, true union with the divine may be experienced; for the Christian is restored to the state in which Adam was before he fell. Assistance in understanding this strand of Adamism and Antinomianism, which in some mystical quarters persisted after the Reformation and was not absent from early Quakerism, is very welcome. Dr. Fraenger's book deserves attention from those interested in the bypaths of Christian piety as well as from those who have "leisure in a democracy" to study great pictures.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

SMALL BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

IN the 1948 Dr. Williams Lecture, *Literary Criticism, Common Sense, and the Bible* (Cambridge: Heffer, 2s.), Sir Frederick Kenyon draws attention to the way in which twentieth-century research has "cut away the foundations of the criticism which in the previous generation regarded itself as 'advanced' ". More recent scientific criticism has established the biblical literature "on a very firm basis of historical probability". G. F. N.

"It is useless to . . . show him up from the standpoint of nineteenth-century liberalism", wrote Lord Eustace Percy in regard to John Knox. This is, in effect, what Miss Marjorie Bowen tries to do in *The Life of John Knox*, reissued in the Thinker's Library (Watts, 3s. 6d.). She fails to understand the man just because she ignores those factors which alone give the clue to his character; his deep religious convictions are dismissed as "obsolete dogmas", and his personal faith as "mechanical piety". John Knox can be understood only against the background of intense religious ferment which characterized the Reformation; he cannot be fitted into a cool, detached rationalism. WILFRED W. BIGGS.

In his William Ainslie Memorial lecture *"Common Ground"*, now published at 2s. by Longmans, Dr. Whale sets out with characteristic incisiveness and clarity those Christian essentials which it has been the function of the Catholic and Protestant traditions to emphasize. While not denying that they are still divided by differences of principle too deeply rooted in history to be ignored, he contends that in face of modern secularism and collectivism they should recognize increasingly that their distinctive geniuses are complementary rather than antithetical, because each witnesses to a fundamental principle of the Gospel.

J. R. M. Butler: *The Present Need for History* (C.U.P., 1s. 6d.). In this inaugural lecture the new Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge vindicates the writing of contemporary history, and urges his fellow historians not only to deepen their roots in academic research, but also to bring forth the fruit of readable books for the ordinary man. E. C. B.

Roger C. Wilson: *Authority, Leadership and Concern* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.). In this the 42nd Swarthmore Lecture, Mr. Roger Wilson expounds the theological basis of Quaker relief work. He holds that Quakerism is not itself a relief organization but a branch of the Christian Church concerned, like the others, "with the worship of God and the bringing of men to His footstool". Its philanthropy springs out of its worship or ought to do so, and the rigorous conditions of relief work very soon discover whether a man's service is securely rooted in his faith, or is simply the expression of his own "unanchored intelligence". Although, therefore, the book is about relief work and gives a good deal of useful and unusual information about its organization, it is really a tract on the Quaker doctrine of the Kingdom of God. As such it is most warmly to be commended, specially to those who are under the false impression that Quakerism is merely selfwill erected into a theological principle. In individual cases that may be so, as indeed we can find the same in all the Churches, but in essence it is far otherwise. It is characteristic of the Society and of this admirable Lecture, that they begin not with some *a priori* theological theory but with what does as a matter of fact happen in the experience of men. Mr. Wilson's treatment is most timely for our generation when we are all trying to find a basis for society that will be really spiritual and have no need of external guarantees.

A. V. MURRAY.

Against That Day, by H. P. Matthews (Epworth Press, 9d.), consists of six study outlines on Christian Creed and Conduct for the use of those about to be called up for National Service. Useful to group leaders in Club and Church of all denominations. J. WILDING.

NEW EDITIONS

A Tale of Two Cities in the New Oxford Illustrated Dickens has an introduction by Sir John Shuckburgh (O.U.P., 8s. 6d.).

The Bible Designed to be read as Literature is now available in a new edition (Heinemann, 21s.); as also is Arthur Mee's *A Children's Life of Jesus* (Hodder & Stoughton, 6s. & 7s. 6d.).

H. V. Morton's *Women of the Bible* is now in its 11th edition (Methuen, 7s. 6d.).

The second edition, revised and expanded, of Sir Charles Sherrington's lecture (first published in 1942) on *Goethe on Nature and on Science* (C.U.P., 2s. 6d.) appears, appropriately enough, in the year of the bicentenary of Goethe's birth. It helps to answer the question as to how so great a man could devote so much time to scientific problems without making any permanent mark in the history of science.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (July). "*The Book of Common Prayer* and the Reformed Churches" by Dr. W. D. Maxwell commemorates Cranmer's liturgical masterpiece. Dr. J. W. Parkes—"The Religious Future of Jerusalem"—thinks that the Anglican and the American Episcopalian Churches should regard the Jerusalem bishopric in a new light. Dr. F. H. Heinemann, Prof. C. A. Campbell and Prof. H. D. Lewis contribute to a symposium (Part One) on "Autonomous Ethics". The Goethe Bicentenary is marked by an article by Dr. J. Lesser ("Goethe the Thinker"); Dom Illtyd Trethowan writes with erudition on "Père de Lubac's *Surnaturel*". There are also articles by Dr. W. B. Primrose, Dr. Robert Eisler, and the Rev. M. Chaning-Pearce.

London Quarterly and Holborn Review (July). "The Body and the Church" (Dr. W. F. Lofthouse) is followed by "The Holy Spirit in the World" (Dr. Maldwyn Edwards). The Rev. Harold Darby writes interestingly on "Cranmer's First Prayer Book"; "The Relations between the Society of Friends and Early Methodism" are further discussed by the Rev. Frank Baker. Literary themes are not overlooked, *e.g.*, "John Galsworthy and the Dilemma of Liberalism" by the Rev. W. S. Handley Jones, and "G. K. Chesterton—Reconsidered" by the Rev. E. M. Dodd.

Expository Times (May-August). Prof. A. M. Hunter in "The Theological Wisdom of James Denney" thinks that the time is "ripe for a re-appraisal of him whom Forsyth once pronounced 'the greatest thinker we have on our side' ". The Rev. J. N. Alexander stresses the importance of the preaching and pastoral aspects of Evangelism. Two articles deal with the "Doctrine of Man"; Prof. H. Clavier discusses "The Kingdom of God: Its Coming and Man's Entry in it"; Dr. E. L. Allen reviews Karl Barth's treatment of the doctrine of man in his *Kirchliche Dogmatik*.

International Review of Missions (July). The first three articles deal concretely with aspects of the racial problem in South Africa—a problem intensified by the election of Dr. Malan's government and symbolized by the propagandist use of the word *apartheid*. Other contributions include "A German View of Medical Missions" by Dr. med. Samuel Müller, and "Indonesia and Religious Liberty" by Dr. J. Verkuryl.

Modern Churchman (June). Dr. R. Dunkerley, a Congregationalist, writes on "Moral Eschatology and the Atonement"; he presents an interpretation of the Cross which he thinks has received insufficient attention. The Rev. K. Henderson has much to say that is arresting, if not new, about "Modern Evangelism". The Editorial castigates as "Disestablishment under the Counter" the Church Assembly's decision to deal with Reform in the relations of Church and State. The controversies and tendencies of our day are reflected in the Rev. J. C. Hardwick's "Can Christian Civilization Survive?"; an older—and more ecclesiastical—world shows its face in the Rev. H. R. Chillingworth's "Archbishop Whately".